THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
AND JOB SATISFACTION AS REPORTED BY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHIEF INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICERS

By

SUSAN KAYSEN CHAPPELL

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of
the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
AND JOB SATISFACTION AS REPORTED BY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHIEF INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICERS

By

SUSAN KAYSEN CHAPPELL

August 1995

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature
of the relationship between measures of organizational
climate and measures of job satisfaction as applied to chief
instructional officers in community colleges. A secondary
purpose was to determine if there were significant
differences in the means for job satisfaction when
controlling for gender, ethnicity, the classification of
community college by size, number of years served as a
college administrator, or the faculty collective bargaining
status of the college.

Chief instructional officers at all member colleges of
the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) were
surveyed. A total of 1,060 surveys were sent and 539 were
returned, rendering a 51% response rate. The data were
analyzed to determine the relationship between measures of

organizational climate and job satisfaction and the differences in mean satisfaction ratings when controlling for gender, ethnicity, classification of community college by size, number of years served as a college administrator, and faculty collective bargaining status of the college.

These analyses revealed that regard for personal concerns, internal communication, organizational structure, and evaluation were the organizational climate factors significantly related to job satisfaction for chief instructional officers. In comparing satisfaction while controlling for demographic variables, significant differences were found in specific categories of each of the demographic variables.

When making comparisons by classification of community college by size, significant differences were found in participation in decision-making, autonomy, power, control, salary, benefits, and professional effectiveness. When making comparisons by gender, significant differences were found in relationships with peers and professional effectiveness. When making comparisons by ethnicity, years of experience as a college administrator, and collective bargaining status of faculty, significant differences were found in salary and benefits. Comparisons by years of experience as a college administrator also yielded significant differences in relationship with supervisor.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Interest in the systematic study of job satisfaction originated in the early part of the twentieth century (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991). Intense interest developed when Elton Mayo and his associates were summoned to observe a series of experiments in progress at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). The purpose of the Hawthorne experiments was to examine the effects of illumination on worker productivity (Hanson, 1985; Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). The unexpected outcomes of these experiments led researchers to conclude, among other things, that it was informal work groups that affected productivity much more profoundly than did aspects of the physical environment or even increases in salary (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). The researchers learned that norms established among the workers influenced worker behavior more than the deliberate controls imposed on the physical working conditions; this discovery destroyed the previously held belief that human workers behaved like machines and therefore there was "one best way" to perform a given task (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939).

The Hawthorne studies (as they were later called) became the cornerstone for research related to employee motivation and efforts to improve productivity in the workplace. Specifically, the Hawthorne studies revealed that perceptions about the organization and the levels of job satisfaction among workers were important factors that contributed to employee performance (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). These findings were paramount in building support for the human relations movement, which stressed that managers should become more sensitive to the diversity of human needs among their employees in order to deal more effectively with motivation and conflict in organizations (Herzberg, 1976; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991).

Originally, human relations theorists viewed degrees of motivation as falling on a single continuum, with job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction being at the extremes. But the research of Frederick Herzberg and his associates (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), conducted on accountants and engineers, produced findings that led to a more precise way of evaluating satisfaction. Herzberg and his associates discovered that when their subjects talked about circumstances that generated satisfaction in their work, they were generally discussing factors that were intrinsic to the job itself; conversely, when they discussed circumstances that caused dissatisfaction, they were generally referring to factors that were extrinsic to the

job, although related to it. This discovery caused Herzberg to separate the factors that he believed contributed to dissatisfaction (hygiene factors) from those he believed contributed to motivation (motivation factors), and hence to develop a two-factor theory of motivation. At the heart of Herzberg's theory was his belief that while dissatisfaction may lower performance, hygiene factors alone could not improve performance (Beck, 1990; Herzberg, 1966).

In recent years, concern for employees and their attitudes toward work has further expanded and evolved; what was once called motivation theory is now often referred to as job satisfaction theory. Researchers have learned that the issue of job satisfaction is extremely complex, and that the interaction of situations, organizations and individuals is a critical element that affects job satisfaction.

Lewin (1935) proposed that behavior could best be understood as a function of the interaction between the individual and the organization. Researchers used this concept as they began to explore job satisfaction in accordance with organizational climate theory. Vroom (1982) concluded that "Job satisfaction must be assumed to be the result of the operation of both situational and personality variables" (p. 173).

Some researchers have examined job satisfaction theory and organizational climate theory in the context of educational settings. Educational settings differ from military and corporate settings in purpose and structure;

their focus historically has been less on efficiency and productivity, and more on student learning, growth, and development (Pace, 1968). In recent years, however, increased attention about how organizational climate and job satisfaction affect institutional effectiveness has developed in light of recent criticisms involving quality and accountability in education (Report of the Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). Furthermore, the rapid pace of change is requiring education to find new and better ways of conducting business (Katz & West, 1992; National Symposium on Higher Education Finance and Management Issues in the 1990s, 1991). In a survey that assessed the organizational climate at Palomar Community College, Barr (1988) expressed the college's hope that a better understanding of organizational climate would provide a basis for improving productivity and the satisfaction of the people who work in the organization. For these reasons, specific research within the context of higher education is both timely and appropriate.

Community colleges, as the largest and fastest growing segment of American higher education (Boggs & Cater, 1994; El-Khawas, 1992; Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck, & Suppiger, 1994), are among the higher education institutions searching for ways to improve institutional effectiveness (Alfred, 1992; Alfred & Kreider, 1991; Welker & Morgan, 1991). As community colleges look ahead to the year 2000, strong leadership is needed to create climate that will

enhance excellence and promote learning (Fryer, 1989; Fryer
& Lovas, 1990). The most successful colleges will be those
that emphasize leadership, accountability, involvement, and
integration in lieu of management, control, complacency, and
isolation (Alfred & Carter, 1993; Amey & Twombley, 1992).
Success will depend largely on presidential leadership and
involvement, viewed as essential elements in building a
stable climate for institutional effectiveness (Duncan &
Harlacher, 1991; Harlacher & Gollattscheck, 1994; Harris,
1992; Rieley, 1992; Vaughan, 1989; Ziel, 1992).

One person, however, can no longer provide total
leadership for an organization (Myran & Howdyshell, 1994;
Senge, 1991). Increased accountability standards, as well
as external political, economic, social and governmental
pressures on higher education are a few of the pressing
concerns that face community college presidents in the 1990s
(Wattenbarger, 1994). These priorities often prevent
presidents from personally interacting with college leaders
on topics such as educational excellence and administrative
effectiveness. In order to accomplish all of their tasks
competently and efficiently, presidents rely on their
leadership teams to carry out the mission of the institution
and to define and deliver quality instructional programs
(Chieffo, 1991).

Academic programs and teaching are at the core of the
community college mission (Myran & Howdyshell, 1994;
O'Banion, 1994). The role of the chief instructional

officer, as the administrator ultimately responsible for teaching and learning, is a focal point in the organizational structure for ensuring quality in academic programs (Perkins, 1991; Portolan, 1992; Vaughan, 1990). The chief instructional officer is usually considered the counterpart to the Academic Vice President or Provost of a four-year institution of higher education, and the second in command in authority behind the president (Ehrle, 1988; Vaughan, 1990).

The responsibilities of chief instructional officers have expanded, intensified, and become increasingly complex with the advent of shared governance and decision-making, Total Quality Management (TQM), and the trend toward flatter, less hierarchical organizations (Johns, 1993; Myran & Howdyshell, 1994; Twombley & Amey, 1994; Wattenbarger, 1994). Specific responsibilities of chief instructional officers include, among other things, ensuring the college's adherence to its central mission of teaching and learning; managing the academic enterprise; selecting, in-service training, and evaluating faculty; and coordinating program identification and development (Ehrle, 1988; Johns, 1993; Vaughan, 1990).

Chief academic officers are generally perceived by their colleagues as holding a high level of influence within the organization (Lewis, 1992). A report from the American Council on Education, however, revealed a high level of turnover among chief academic officers as well as other top

level administrators (Glick, 1992). Turnover is a costly
and inefficient dilemma for organizations (Glick, 1992;
Mirvis & Lawler, 1980), and is related to job satisfaction
(Lawler, 1986; Nkereuwem, 1990).

Statement of the Problem

Although the relationship between organizational
climate and job satisfaction is well established in
industrial settings, less is known about the nature of this
relationship as it applies to educational settings.
Community college chief instructional officers are
responsible for the college's academic program; their work
affects the entire organization, and is particularly related
to faculty morale and student success. High turnover in the
chief instructional officer position is costly and
disruptive to organizations (Glick, 1992; Mirvis & Lawler,
1980). Learning more about the nature of the relationship
between climate and satisfaction among chief academic
officers may assist colleges in improving perceptions of
climate and enhancing job satisfaction for this group of
administrators.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature
of the relationship between measures of organizational
climate and measures of job satisfaction as applied to chief
instructional officers in community colleges. A secondary
purpose was to determine if there were significant
differences in means for job satisfaction within the context

of organizational climate when controlling for gender, ethnicity, classification of the community college by size, number of years experience as a college administrator, and the collective bargaining status of the community college. Specifically, the research addressed the following questions:

1. How do community college chief instructional officers perceive organizational climate at their respective institutions, using a set of seven identified factors for climate?

2. Using the same seven climate factors as an index, how satisfied are community college chief instructional officers with the organizational climate at their respective institutions?

3. How important is each of eight identified job satisfaction variables to community college chief instructional officers in the performance of their specific job responsibilities?

4. For each of eight job satisfaction variables, is there a significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and a set of seven measures of satisfaction with the organizational climate, as reported by community college chief instructional officers?

5. Is there a significant difference in the means of eight job satisfaction variables for community college chief instructional officers when compared by gender of the respondent, ethnic origin of the respondent, classification

of the community college by size, length of time served as a
college administrator, and collective bargaining status of
the community college?

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following definitions
are being used:

<u>Chief instructional officer</u> is the administrator
responsible for overseeing a community college's academic
program, including faculty recruitment and development, and
program identification and development (Vaughan, 1990).

<u>Job satisfaction</u> refers to a person's attitude or
emotional response (either positive or negative) toward his
or her job (Beck, 1990; McCormick & Ilgen, 1980; Nkereuwem,
1990).

<u>Organizational climate</u> refers to the collective
personality of an organization; it is an accumulation of
intangible perceptions that individuals have of various
aspects of the environment of an organization (Deas, 1994;
Owens, 1991; Steers & Porter, 1975).

Limitations

This research was conducted acknowledging the following
limitations:

1. The study was limited to chief instructional
officers in community colleges that were 1994 members of the
American Association of Community Colleges (AACC).

2. The study focused only on organizational climate and
job satisfaction as they pertain to community college chief

instructional officers, and not their subordinates and superordinates.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for several reasons. First, changes are occurring in what people expect from and are willing to put into their jobs and careers (Flynn, 1994; Katzell, 1979). Second, demographic changes in the workforce have raised concerns about how to appropriately match motivational practices with the needs and values of an increasingly diverse group of employees (Katzell & Thompson, 1990). Third, the creation of a positive organizational climate is critical to the success of an organization (Roe & Baker, 1989). Fourth, the chief instructional officer plays a pivotal role in delivering quality programs and services to community college students, therefore his or her performance is critical to the success of the college as a whole (Perkins, 1991; Vaughan, 1990). Fifth, there is excessively high turnover among chief instructional officers (Glick, 1992). Finally, little research has been conducted on community college personnel, and what has been done usually situation specific to a particular college (Gabert, 1994). Furthermore, when research is conducted, it is usually focused on non-managerial personnel, and few studies have specifically addressed the relationship of job satisfaction to the workplace environment as it applies to college administrators (Chieffo, 1991; Kline & Boyd, 1991).

Findings of this study have advanced the body of knowledge by testing the theoretical constructs of job satisfaction and organizational climate as they apply to community college chief instructional officers, and by determining whether or not the model previously developed applies to this sector of the higher education administration.

Summary

The theories and constructs related to job satisfaction and organizational climate have been the subjects of investigations for over five decades. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate has been documented in a variety of work settings, but less frequently in educational settings. This study tests the theories and constructs of job satisfacation and organizational climate in the specific context of community college chief instructional officers. Chapter 2 follows with a review of the literature.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Job satisfaction has been of interest to researchers because of a perceived association with absenteeism, productivity, turnover, and general mental health of employees (Beck, 1990; Gruneberg, 1979; Hersi, 1993; Herzberg et al., 1976; McBride, Munday, & Tunnell, 1992; Pardee, 1990; Vroom, 1982; Vroom & Jago, 1988). The Hawthorne studies revealed that money was less of a motivator than had been previously thought, and that social environment, or what has since come to be known as organizational climate, exerted a significant influence on productivity and morale (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Systematic study of the relationship between the two constructs, however, did not begin until the late 1960s, when numerous studies confirmed that organizational climate was a relevant factor in understanding job satisfaction in the workplace. Examples of these early studies include Friedlander and Margulies (1969), Downey, Hellriegel, and Slocum (1975), Schneider and Snyder (1975), and Payne, Fineman, and Wall (1976).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined in a variety of ways. Vroom (1982) defined job satisfaction as "the affective

orientation of individuals toward work roles they are
presently occupying" (p.99); Locke (1976) stated that job
satisfaction is "a pleasurable or positive emotional state
resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job
experiences" (p. 1300). Bretz and Judge (1994), referred to
job satisfaction as "the individual worker's subjective
evaluation of the degree to which his or her requirements
are met by the work environment" (p.32). Although
definitions vary, there is general consensus that job
satisfaction pertains to the emotional feeling toward one's
job that is experienced during the course of employment
(Jahanshihi, 1985; Satterlee, 1988). For purposes of this
research, job satisfaction was defined as a person's
attitude, or emotional response, toward his or her job
(Beck, 1990; McCormick & Ilgen, 1980; Nkereuwem, 1990).

Elton Mayo and his associates generated widespread
interest in the topic of job satisfaction, or motivation,
when they became involved in a series of experiments at the
Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in Chicago
in 1927. What had originally been intended as a year long
study involving five workers and how illumination affected
their productivity on the job, expanded into a five year
series of experiments and interviews involving approximately
20,000 workers (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). The
original impetus for the Hawthorne studies stemmed from
incidences of fatigue and monotony in the industrial work
setting. As working conditions were manipulated, the

researchers predicted that productivity would either increase or decrease accordingly. Regardless of the controlled variations in working conditions, however, the productivity of the subjects under investigation increased. As the research progressed, more questions than answers were found, necessitating alteration and expansion of the project.

Mayo, professor of industrial research at Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, was the primary consultant on the project. As he and his staff of researchers examined the workers and their environment more closely, they discovered that informal work groups within the organization were playing a dominant role in employee motivation and productivity. Results of these experiments caused Mayo to propose that norms established in these informal work groups imposed a greater influence on employee attitudes and motivation than wages or physical conditions that had been manipulated in an effort to affect and predict performance (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Subsequent interest in employee motivation flourished, with the publication of literally thousands of articles on the subject in the years that followed. What had begun as supervisors' pursuits of maximum productivity in the industrialized work setting has expanded to the present day concern for overall organizational effectiveness in all types of work settings (Katzell & Thompson, 1990).

Current human resource practices emphasize concern for employee welfare because each employee is viewed as part of the organizational team. But knowledge of how to build satisfaction among employees is not only important because of its perceived value in enhancing employee morale and productivity. Equally important are the devastating economic implications for the organization that fails to deter employee dissatisfaction. Deal and Jenkins (1994) reported that dissatisfied employees assert themselves through "blatant non-productivity, mindless conformance to policy and procedures, frequent absenteeism, intentional sabotage, and choosing to . . . leave the organization at a critical time" (p.37). Building satisfaction among employees is achievable if an organization maintains a positive social organizational environment, by providing strong communication, autonomy, opportunities for participation, and a sense of mutual trust (Argyris, 1957; Likert, 1967; Ostroff, 1992).

<u>Job Satisfaction Theories</u>

Job satisfaction theories are divided into two broad categories: content theories and process theories (Hanson, 1985). Content theories of job satisfaction are grounded in the belief that motivation comes from within an individual, as opposed to being caused from an external force. According to Hanson, content theories assume that

1. Needs or drives initiate, channel, and sustain goal directed behavior;

2. Needs or drives are activated when an equilibrium imbalance is felt;

3. Needs or drives are prioritized into levels;

4. When a need is fulfilled it no longer generates motivation; and

5. All individuals share basically the same prioritization of needs and drives.

Process theories, on the other hand, reject the assumptions that human behavior is generated by a common set of needs or drives, and that all humans share the same priorities in satisfying those needs. Instead, process theories propose that a greater understanding of motivation can only be gained by trying to identify the process that people go through as they try to achieve their goals. Process theories propose that although the factors that initiate motivation may vary, the mechanics of initiating, channeling, and sustaining behavior are generic ones (Hanson, 1985). Inherent assumptions of process theories are that

1. People exert effort toward obtaining goal-related rewards as long as there is an expectancy that the rewards can be achieved;

2. People are autonomous beings who independently seek out solutions for achieving goals through the most effective routes available to them;

3. Effort is maintained as long as goal-directed actions are perceived as successful; and

4. Effort is no longer sustained when the goal has been achieved or if a perception develops that the goal will not be achieved.

In short, content theories are concerned with identifying the source of motivation for employees in the workplace, while process theories are concerned with understanding the process of how motivation occurs. The following pages include brief summaries of five prominent content theories, two prominent process theories, and some of the criticisms that have been expressed about each.

Content Theories

Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Abraham Maslow (1954) believed that human aspirations had to be considered in order to fully understand behavior. He further proposed that aspirations could not be addressed until more basic human needs were satisfied. He classified human motivation into five categories of needs, described as

1. Physiological needs: food, water, sex, and shelter;

2. Safety needs: protection against danger, threat, and deprivation;

3. Social needs: giving and receiving love, friendship, affection, belonging, association, and acceptance;

4. Ego needs: the need for achievement, adequacy, strength, and freedom; and

5. Self-actualization needs: the need to realize
one's potentialities for continued self-development and
the desire to become more and more of what one is and
what one is capable of becoming.

(Hamner & Organ, 1978, pp. 137 & 138)

Maslow argued that the least satisfied needs served as the
greatest motivators, and further that humans were motivated
to satisfy these needs according to the hierarchical order
(Beck, 1990; Maslow, 1954).

Although Maslow was criticized for failing to provide
empirical evidence for his theory, his logic and common-
sense approach to motivation brought widespread acceptance
among students of motivation theory. Considerable formal
research was subsequently conducted on Maslow's theory,
particularly during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. In a
review of these studies, Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975)
reported finding evidence that the activation of higher
order needs depended in part on the satisfaction of lower
level needs; however, they concluded that the social, ego,
and self-actualization needs did not operate in a
hierarchical manner.

Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation. Frederick
Herzberg, Bernard Mausner and B. Snyderman (1959) extended
Maslow's theory of motivation, applying it specifically to
the workplace. After considerable observation and research,
Herzberg rejected what Maslow and other theorists had
conceptualized as a single continuum of

motivation/satisfaction. Instead, he proposed that
satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not diametrically
opposed concepts. In other words, something that failed to
satisfy a need was not necessarily a source of
dissatisfaction. Upon completion of a study involving 200
engineers and accountants, Herzberg and his associates
developed a model with two continua instead of one, with the
opposite of satisfaction being no satisfaction, and the
opposite of dissatisfaction being no dissatisfaction. An
important conclusion that emerged from this research was
that some factors in the workplace served as deterrents to
dissatisfaction, while others served as motivators (Herzberg
et al., 1959). The deterrents were referred to as hygiene
factors, and included

1. Company policy;

2. Supervision;

3. Working conditions;

4. Interpersonal relations;

5. Salary;

6. Status;

7. Job security; and

8. Personal life. (Herzberg et al., 1959)

Herzberg hypothesized that the extrinsic factors could
dissuade job dissatisfaction, but were incapable of
motivating employees. On the other hand, certain intrinsic
factors or conditions could serve as motivators. Such
motivators included

1. Achievement;

2. Work itself;

3. Recognition;

4. Responsibility;

5. Advancement; and

6. Growth. (Herzberg et al., 1959)

Herzberg (1976) summarized his theory by stating that "[a] deprivation in hygiene factors can lead to job dissatisfaction, but their amelioration does not lead to job satisfaction" (p. 61). Numerous studies have been conducted in an attempt to prove or disprove Herzberg's two factor theory of motivation; a few examples include Fairman (1973), Thomas (1977), Groseth (1978), Kozal, (1979), Burr, 1980), and Griffin (1990).

Alderfer's ERG theory. Clayton Alderfer (1972) expanded the theories of Maslow and Herzberg in his Environment-Relatedness-Growth Theory. He first reduced Maslow's five-tiered hierarchy to three distinct classifications of needs:

1. Existence, a merger of Maslow's two lower order needs, physiological and safety;

2. Relatedness, a merger of Maslow's social and ego needs; and

3. Growth, expressed as self-actualization by Maslow. Next, Alderfer rejected the idea of a hierarchy and the assumption that the levels of needs were sequential.

Instead, he argued that it was possible to experience desires to satisfy all three types of needs at once (Alderfer, 1972). Alderfer believed that frustration of one's existence or relatedness needs could lead to a temporary reduction in the pursuit of growth needs, and that when a greater opportunity for growth and personal development was present, existence needs would take on lesser importance. If growth needs could not be satisfied, Alderfer speculated that a person might give greater attention to existence and relatedness needs (Lauffer, 1985). Although not much research has been conducted on ERG theory, Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) reported that the ideas presented by Alderfer appear to be gaining support in the field.

McClelland's need for achievement theory. Taking a slightly different view of the nature of individual needs, David McClelland proposed that needs were learned through the environment, and further that when a person experienced a strong need, it served as motivation to trigger behavior that would satisfy that need (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1976). The need for achievement, referred to as "n Ach", was described as a person's desire to independently master objects, ideas, and other people by exercising his or her talents, for the purpose of enhancing self-esteem (Pardee, 1990). Typically, persons with a high need for achievement (a) enjoy accepting personal responsibility for problem solving, (b) set moderate achievement goals, (c) are

willing to take calculated risks, and (d) expect concrete
feedback about how well they are doing (Johnson &
McClelland, 1984). Implicit in McClelland's theory is the
idea that persons possessing a high need for achievement are
satisfied when this need is met, and that failure to achieve
diminishes the motivation to work hard in an organization.
Hanson (1985) stated that high achievers are respected for
their ability to produce results, and are constantly driven
to improve themselves and their organization. Consistent
with this idea is the finding that as a group, managers and
administrators possess a high need for self-fulfillment
(Glick, 1992; Lawler, 1986).

    <u>Glasser's control theory</u>. William Glasser (1994)
recently proposed a new model referred to as control theory.
A basic tenet of control theory is that it is impossible to
make a person do anything that he or she does not want to
do. Applied to a work setting, this suggests that the only
option for a manager or leader is to teach the employee a
better way. In keeping with human relations theories,
control theory asserts that employees want to do a good job,
therefore, when an employee is taught a better way, he or
she will presumably continue to use the new method. Like
Maslow, Glasser proposed that all humans possess five basic
needs:

    1. Survival;

    2. Love and belonging;

    3. Power/recognition;

4. Freedom; and

5. Fun.

The more managers can foster a sense of friendship, encourage employee input and evaluation of meaningful tasks, permit freedom of expression and opportunities to share ideas, and incorporate laughter into the work setting, the more quality will be achieved (Glasser, 1994).

Criticisms of content theories. Criticisms of content theories usually fall into three main categories. First, critics claim that there is very little empirical data to support the conclusions presented. Second, they charge that the theories erroneously assume that all human beings are alike in terms of what motivates them, and further that all situations are alike. Finally, critics argue that content theories of motivation would be better articulated as theories of job satisfaction (Hanson, 1985).

Process Theories

Equity theory. J. Stacy Adams (1965) initiated equity theory, which emphasizes employees' desires to receive an equitable return for their labor. According to equity theory, motivation is triggered by an employee's need for fair treatment (Katzell & Thompson, 1990; Pinder, 1984). Workers compare how hard they work with compensation received for that work; if there is a perceived discrepancy, workers become dissatisfied (Adams, 1965; Beck, 1990). While perceptions of equity and inequity may have either an internal or external reference, the important aspect of this

theory was that if inequity is perceived, then tension and dissatisfaction will result (Beck, 1990). Accordingly, in their study of employees from education and industry, Witt and Nye (1992) concluded that fairness was an important element of job satisfaction. Specifically the researchers found that employees who perceived that the pay and promotions systems in their organizations were fair were more likely to feel satisfied with their jobs than employees who did not perceive those systems to be fair. Additionally, workers who perceived that they were involved in the organization's decision-making processes were more likely to perceive equity and fairness in personnel decisions, even when those decisions were not favorable (Witt & Myers, 1992).

Expectancy theory. The constructs of expectancy theory, also known as instrumentality theory, path-goal theory, expectancy/valence theory, and valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory, attempted to identify the relationships among variables that affected performance. Drawing on earlier works of Lewin (1935), who posited that human behavior was a function of both personality and the perceived environment, Victor Vroom (1982) developed the first complete version of expectancy theory. Vroom identified three variables, or determinants of job performance: (a) motivation, (b) abilities and traits, and (c) role perceptions, or role clarity. Most of the research on expectancy theory has focused on the first variable,

motivation (Steers & Porter, 1975). The underlying assumptions of expectancy theory are that

1. Every individual desires particular benefits and rewards for the work he or she performs, and that these desires may vary among individuals; and

2. Every individual has expectations about whether what he or she does in a given situation will lead to a particular outcome (Lauffer, 1985).

Conceptually, expectancy theory was comprised of three key concepts:

1. Valence, the extent to which a person values a particular outcome or reward;

2. Expectancy, the perceived probability that a given activity will lead to a particular outcome or reward; and

3. Instrumentality, the extent to which a person believes that his or her performance will lead to a specific outcome or reward (Lauffer, 1985; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991; Vroom, 1982).

Porter and Lawler later expanded Vroom's expectancy model to include factors that affected an employee's performance and satisfaction (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975).

As noted by Hanson (1985), satisfaction is treated very differently in process theories than it is in content theories. In content theories, job satisfaction is assumed to result in quality performance. In other words, if a person is satisfied, he or she will perform better.

Conversely, process theories argue that the quality performance will lead to job satisfaction.

Criticisms of process theories. Criticisms of process theories are similar to those directed at content theories. First, critics claim that there is limited empirical data to support the conclusions posited by the theories. More often than not, research has rendered inconclusive evidence that satisfaction and performance are directly related at all, much less that there is a definitive causal relationship. Additionally, critics contend that it is difficult to create and define appropriate measures for producing the data called for in process theories (Hanson, 1985). Pinder (1984), for example, reported flaws in research conducted on equity theory, which resulted in questions about the validity of the testing itself. Still other critics discredit research on expectancy theory because they claim that it is erroneous to assume that the individuals under investigation have access to all the information they need to make good decisions about probabilities and values of success. Finally, critics question whether subjects can or will consistently use the information they do have to appropriately make decisions concerning which actions are best (Hanson, 1985; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991). Problems such as these have made process theories extremely difficult to apply, although, Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) endorsed them as decidedly useful concepts. In spite of the shortcomings noted in both content and process theories,

researchers continue to rely on these theories as the basis for continued research on job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction Factors under Investigation

Participation in Decision-making

Participation in decision-making was defined as the college's process for decision-making and opportunities for involvement by the employee to participate in that process. According to Fryer and Lovas (1991), power in an organization is exercised through decision-making; since every person in an organization exercises some level of deciding, every person has power. Participation in decision-making, as described in Lawler's (1992) involvement oriented approach to management, results in an environment that encourages its leaders to use their expertise rather than their positional authority to get employees involved. On the practical side, employee participation in decision-making has been viewed as important because of its perceived links to the acceptance and implementation of change within an organization (Conway, 1984).

Participation in decision-making was also associated with (a) job satisfaction and satisfaction with the organization in general, and (b) productivity (Boone, 1986; Conway, 1984; Witt & Myers, 1992). Research has shown that employees are more likely to become involved in decisions that directly affect them, a factor that could yield both greater satisfaction and higher productivity (Kanter, 1985; Twombley & Amey, 1994; Vroom & Jago, 1988). Lawler (1986)

reported that organizations that provide managers and administrators with the opportunity to participate in decisions will engender greater satisfaction in these employees.

Autonomy, Power, Control

Autonomy, power, control was defined as the amount or degree of jurisdiction or discretion that the employee is able to exercise while performing the tasks of his or her position. Davis (1981) defined autonomy as the freedom to do one's job as one sees fit, adding that most employees in educational institutions consider high autonomy to be an important requirement for job satisfaction and success. Some have considered autonomy to be the antithesis of structure (Twombley & Amey, 1994), but Kanter (1985) contended that "true freedom is realized not in the absence of structure, but rather in a clear structure that enables people to work within established boundaries in an autonomous and creative way" (p. 248). Nevertheless, Polishook and Nielsen (1989) argued that increased bureaucratization and managerial hierarchy have diminished autonomy by eroding the mechanisms of shared governance.

Power was defined as the ability to command a favorable share of resources, opportunities and rewards for followers (Harlacher & Gollattscheck, 1994). Shakeshaft (1987), however, noted that power is often defined differently by men and women. Shakeshaft reported that women were generally more likely to use power to empower others, and to

stress collaboration and cooperation, while their male
counterparts were more often inclined to view these traits
as signs of weakness. Power was considered desirable
because with it came control, particularly in the decision-
making process (Griffiths, 1968). Empowerment as described
by Block (1987) and Thor (1993, 1994) suggests shared power,
and proposes that supervisors must give employees the
authority and information they need to make wise
organizational decisions and to solve problems. An
organization that fails to empower its employees reduces
control and therefore limits employees' contributions to the
organization (Johnson & Indvik, 1990).

Sometimes perceptions of how much administrators
empower faculty vary. For example, Jenks (1992) found that
faculty perceived themselves as far less empowered than did
the administration in his study of a single community
college.

Fisher (1994) described control as "jurisdiction or
discretion in relation to daily events and situations"
(p. 29). According to Glasser, we all want to have control
over our actions, and we are in control when we are able to
satisfy our own needs. Albrecht and Adelman (1987), defined
perceived control as "an individual's belief that his or her
behaviors produce desirable causal effects in the
environment" (p.6). Organizations that gave managers and
administrators control over their own work created a higher
level of satisfaction among these employees (Lawler, 1986).

It can be deduced that the degree to which the leadership promotes perceived control through empowerment may affect job satisfaction (Kline & Boyd, 1991). If there is a meaningful relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate as it applies to chief instructional officers, then there are implications not only for the way chief instructional officers carry out their responsibilities, but for how their actions affect faculty and ultimately, student success (Alfred & Kreider, 1991).

Relationships with Colleagues

Relationships with colleagues was defined as the quality of the affiliation that an employee maintains with his or her peers, subordinates, and supervisor. Interpersonal relationships has been consistently reported as an important aspect of job satisfaction. Research conducted on community college faculty by Hutton and Jobe (1985) for example, documented the positive affect that relationships with colleagues has on satisfaction. Research by Milosheff (1990) resulted in similar findings: "Pleasant, concerned and enthusiastic co-workers establish an environment worth cultivating" (p.14).

As organizations search for new strategies to improve effectiveness, the teambuilding techniques and quality circles that are being incorporated into the workplace (Ewell, 1993; Marchese, 1993), will make positive and open working relationships with colleagues not just a fortunate

incidence, but a necessity for engendering satisfaction and accomplishing the tasks of the organization.

Salary and Benefits

Salary and benefits was defined as the perceived equity and adequacy of the salary and benefits package received by the employee. According to Herzberg et al. (1959) salary was hygiene factor. Most content and process theories, in fact, have suggested that extrinsic reward systems such as routine pay increases will not motivate employees, although they may be effective in deterring dissatisfaction (Pardee, 1990). Some studies conducted in educational settings, such as Groseth's (1978) and Levy's (1989), have confirmed that little value is placed on salary, however, the findings are not conclusive.

Lawler (1992) proposed that high involvement organizations should reward employees based on how well the organization as a whole performs, and further that employees should be able to influence the organization's reward system. In keeping with equity theory, Lawler also stated that any system for rewarding employees must be perceived as fair. Some elements of Lawler's high involvement model have been incorporated into higher education management styles, but issues concerning salary remain largely locked in tradition, a likely consequence of the legislative authority that dictates the way public funds are spent. In two-year colleges, where 69% of the institutions host faculty unions (Annunziato, 1993), equitable salary and benefits for

faculty has become a major issue for collective bargaining agreements. The issue of collective bargaining will be addressed later in the review of literature.

<u>Professional Effectiveness</u>

Professional effectiveness was defined as the perceived overall effectiveness of the employee in his or her position. Herzberg et al. (1959) identified the work itself, achievement, and growth as factors that affected satisfaction. In a 1993 national study of workforce attitudes cited in Ginsberg (1994b), 52% of the respondents identified "doing a good job" as their definition of success. Implicit in these responses is confirmation of the need for achievement theory as stated by McClelland et al. (1953). This theory suggests that individuals with high need for achievement are constantly driven to improve themselves and their organizations. Managers and administrators tend to possess a high need for achievement and self-fulfillment (Glick, 1992; Lawler, 1986).

<u>Organizational Climate</u>

Organizations and employees depend on each other (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Elton Mayo was the among the first to address the social environment as an element important to employee satisfaction and productivity (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Since that time, researchers have expanded the ideas that emerged from the Hawthorne studies and developed a number of definitions of what is now referred to as organizational climate. Forehand

(1968) defined climate as an interaction between environmental and personal variables. He argued that organizational characteristics were perceived, selected, and interpreted by the individual, and that the demands of the organization were accepted specifically in light of an individual's motives. Likewise, they were satisfied to the extent permitted by the individual's abilities. Downey, Hellriegel and Slocum (1975) also stated that organizational climate was an individual's perception of his work environment.

More generally, organizational climate definitions imply a collective quality. Tagiuri (1968) described climate as the environment as perceived by an organization's members. Evan (1968) extended the definition to include the perceptions of persons outside the organization, stating that "Organizational climate is a multidimensional perception of the essential attributes or character of an organizational system" (p. 110). Litwin and Stringer (1968) stated that climate was a concept used to describe the subjective nature or quality of organizational environment. As research on organizational climate proceeded, Schneider and Snyder (1975) described climate as "a characteristic of organizations that is reflected in the descriptions employees make of the policies, practices, and conditions which exist in the work environment" (p. 326). More recently, Fryer and Lovas (1990) stated that climate is the emotional atmosphere of the organization. To Deas (1994),

"climate is a collection of intangibles that support and encourage all the players to work toward a common goal-- learning" (p. 44). Terms often used to describe organizational climate include (a) open, (b) warm, (c) easy-going, (d) informal, (e) cold, (f) hostile, (g) rigid, or (h) closed (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991). Although distinct classifications of climates exist (Croft & Halpin, 1963), Smith (1989) concluded that each organization possesses its own distinct organizational climate.

<div align="center">Organizational Climate Theories</div>

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)

Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft conducted extensive research to develop a thorough conceptualization and measurement of organizational climate. Although their research was conducted in an elementary school setting, their work provided the basis for understanding climate in higher education settings. They mapped organizational climate profiles for seventy-one elementary schools in their original sample, and identified six specific types of organizational climate (Croft & Halpin, 1963; Hoy & Miskel, 1982). An outcome of their work, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) has enabled researchers to measure organizational climate in elementary schools. The types of organizational climate identified by Halpin and Croft include

1. Open climate. The open climate is characterized by teachers who work well together and exhibit high Esprit.

Group members enjoy friendly relations, but little intimacy. The principal generally exhibits a genuine behavior that allows for leadership to emerge from among the faculty.

2. <u>Autonomous climate</u>. The autonomous climate is characterized by almost complete freedom afforded by the principal to the faculty. Accordingly, the faculty work well together and are able to successfully accomplish the tasks of the organization. Morale is high, although not as high as in the open climate. The principal tends to remain aloof, but consistently sets a good example through hard work. Although genuine and flexible, this principal's range of administrative behavior tends to be more restricted than that of the principal in the open climate.

3. <u>Controlled climate</u>. The controlled climate is characterized by a sense of urgency for task achievement, often at the expense of social needs and satisfaction. Nevertheless, morale is generally high in the controlled climate, as faculty focus heavily on getting their jobs done. Teachers exhibit an expectancy of being told precisely how to accomplish their tasks; consequently, there is considerable paperwork. The principal could be described as domineering and directive, with little flexibility for having things done any way other than the prescribed way. There is little caring for others' feelings in this climate; the principal is for the most part interested in getting the tasks completed as directed.

4: _Familiar climate_. In contrast to the controlled climate, the familiar climate is characterized by a conspicuously friendly atmosphere, indicating high attention to the social needs of the group members. Little control is exerted by the principal, as there seems to be a greater interest in maintaining a feeling of one, big, happy family. Production and task fulfillment are not typically emphasized, consequently, few work to full capacity. Little evaluation and direction is visible in the familiar climate.

5. _Paternal climate_. The paternal climate is characterized by ineffective attempts by the principal to control the faculty and to satisfy their social needs. Principal behavior is best described as nongenuine and nonmotivating.

6. _Closed climate_. The closed climate is characterized as one in which group members enjoy neither high task achievement nor high social cohesiveness. Teachers do not work well together, and apathy abounds. The principal is ineffective and unconcerned with the welfare of the faculty and staff (Croft & Halpin, 1963; Hoy & Miskel, 1982; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991).

Considerable research has been conducted using the OCDQ, with two revised versions having been subsequently developed, one specifically for elementary schools and one specifically for high schools (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991). Although some researchers have used the OCDQ to test organizational climate in higher education settings, this

has generally been considered inappropriate (Owens, 1995).
Halpin and Croft's general conclusion was that the open
climate was the most desirable and most effective type of
organizational climate.

The Organizational Climate Index (OCI)

Like Halpin and Croft, George Stern (1970) asserted
that excellent schools were characterized by a distinct type
of organizational climate. Drawing on earlier works by
Lewin (1935) and Murray, Barrett, and Homburger (1938),
Stern sought to create a climate index tool that could be
used in higher education settings. By applying the notion
of the human personality to the organization, he
conceptualized how climate affected employee behavior.
Using Murray's concept of need-press, Stern described the
tension that existed between the needs of the individual
(Need) and the priorities of the organization (Press).
Stated another way, Need represented the determinants of
behavior in individuals, and Press represented the
determinants of behavior in organizations (Bretz & Judge,
1994). Stern's work resulted in the development of two
instruments designed to measure need-press factors in
institutions of higher education: (a) the Activities Index
(AI) and (b) the College Characteristics Index (CCI). These
instruments have been used successfully on a number of
college campuses (Owens, 1995).

Subsequently, the College Characteristics Index (CCI)
was adapted by Stern and Carl Steinhoff to create a tool

that could be used in a wider variety of social contexts.
The result was the Organizational Climate Index (OCI), which
measured six climate factors:

1. <u>Intellectual climate</u>, an indicator of the
    degree to which all employees support scholarly
    interests at the institution;

2. <u>Achievement standards</u>, an indicator of
    the extent to which personal achievement is stressed in
    the organization;

3. <u>Personal dignity</u>, an indicator of the degree to
    which consideration and support is afforded the
    individual in the organization;

4. <u>Organizational effectiveness</u>, an indicator of the
    extent to which work environments encourage and
    facilitate the effective performance of tasks;

5. <u>Orderliness</u>, an indicator of the amount of
    organizational press that is exerted on the employees;
    and

6. <u>Impulse control</u>, an indicator of how much personal
    expression is permitted or restrained (Owens, 1994 &
    1995).

To summarize, the two basic dimensions used to describe
organizational climate using the Organizational Climate
Index (OCI) are (a) need press and (b) control press;
together they are analyzed to provide a description of an
institution's climate. One strength of the need-press
approach was that it was based on a strong (albeit complex)

theoretical concept of organizational climate that has withstood the test of time and empirical examination (Owens, 1995). The OCI has been found to be an effective tool for analyzing climate, however, its length and complexity have limited its use. Recognizing its potential value, publishers were encouraged to develop a simpler and shorter version. Over time, the OCI has proven to be applicable across a wide range of educational settings, from elementary school through college (Owens, 1995).

The Total Quality Movement

Total Quality Management (TQM) was introduced to the educational domain as a promising way to initiate much needed reform (Acebo, 1994; Cohen & Brawer, 1994; Wattenbarger, 1994). TQM has its roots in the corporate sector and has only relatively recently become adapted in the education workplace (Acebo, 1994; Heverly & Cornesky, 1992). Major premises of TQM included the quest for continuous improvement, client centered philosophy, and teamwork (Brigham, 1993; Ewell, 1993; Seymour, 1993; Spence & Stuckman, 1994). In contrast to traditional management philosophies that were driven by the assumption that improvement was associated with increased cost, the TQM philosophy stressed continuous process improvement that enhanced productivity and reduced costs (Heverly & Cornesky, 1992; Staas, 1994). In light of shrinking allocations for education (Acebo, 1994), these ideas have gained increasing favor in many educational circles.

Of central importance to the constructs of organizational climate and job satisfaction was the TQM process that shifts the focus of the organization away from an administrative hierarchy and toward each employee's intrinsic motivation to perform well on behalf of the customers who need to be served (Cohen & Brawer, 1994). This practice was consistent with Glasser's (1994) control theory, which maintained that satisfaction of an individual's natural needs for power, freedom, and fun will lead him or her to perform quality work.

Colleges are still in the beginning stages of movement toward models of shared governance and decision-making as prescribed by TQM (Wattenbarger, 1994). Maricopa Community College District (Arizona), Florida Community College at Jacksonville (Florida), Red River Community College (Manitoba, Canada), and Delaware County Community College are four examples of community colleges that have invested time and effort in adapting the concepts of TQM to their organizations (Assar, 1993; Knowles, 1994; Spence & Stuckman, 1994; Staas, 1994). Despite the reported success of these colleges' efforts, TQM was not without skeptics (Fisher, 1993; Schauerman & Peachy, 1993). Among the most skeptical were faculty, who perceived TQM as a productivity driven widget model, whose emphasis on customer service resulted in the proverbial tail wagging the dog when the concept was applied to education (Schauerman & Peachy, 1993).

Even those who favored TQM's integration into the educational environment have cautioned that it must be individualized to meet each institution's needs (Ewell, 1993). Total Quality Management is a philosophy that requires strong commitment from the organization's leaders, as well as training and empowerment of employees at all levels of the organization (Staas, 1994; Thor, 1993, 1994).

Person-Environment Fit Theory

Acknowledging the important relationship between the individual and the organization, Argyris (1957) noted that conflict often develops in an organization when there is a clash between the organization's needs and the needs of the individual. Argyris postulated that the formal principles of the typical organization cause subordinates at all levels to experience competition, rivalry, and sometimes hostility, and when the organization exercises these principles, it generally results in a tendency for employees to develop a focus toward the parts rather than the whole. Argyris also argued that an incompatibility between the individual and the organization developed because the formal principles were inconsistent with the mature adult personality. Predictably, this incongruence culminated in frustration, failure, short term perspective and conflict within the organization. Argyris believed that employees dealt with the incongruence in any of several ways:

1. Withdrawal from the organization, either through
absenteeism or resignation;

2. Indifference and apathy on the job;

3. Resistance through deception or sabotage;

4. Attempts to climb the hierarchy and find a better
job;

5. Affiliation with groups such as unions in an effort
to restore the balance of power; and/or

6. Socialization of their children to believe that
work was unrewarding and had little prospect for
advancement. (Bolman & Deal, 1991)

In contrast to incongruence, congruence was the term
used to describe a fit between an employee and the
organization. Stern (1970) was among the first to explore
the notion of measuring the congruence between an employee
and his or her environment. Downey, Hellriegel, and Slocum
(1975) also used the term congruence to describe the
relationship between the individual and the organization.
They postulated that individuals who were in congruence with
their environment tended to be high performers who expressed
a greater level of job satisfaction than individuals who
experienced a lesser degree of congruence or fit. Vroom
(1982) and Vroom and Jago (1988) pursued similar research
based on their belief that all people are different and
therefore they perceive situations differently.

To generalize this concept, proponents of person-
environment fit theory contended that in ideal situations,

the values of the employee were congruent with the mission and goals of the organization. Stated another way, person-environment fit implies that the person and the job operate as joint determinants of individual and organizational outcomes (Bess, 1988; Edwards, 1991).

Person-environment fit theory, alternately referred to as person-organization fit or job fit theory, was directly related to the concepts of organizational climate and job satisfaction, and has received increased attention in recent years (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Caplan & Harrison, 1993; Chatman, 1991; Gati, 1989). Chatman referred to person-environment fit as the congruence between patterns of organizational values and patterns of individual values as they pertain to the organization. Accordingly, the importance of careful selection and deliberate socialization of employees into the work environment was documented by Chatman, Caplan, and Bretz and Judge. Similarly, Cohen and Brawer (1994) observed that linking institutional purposes and people was at the heart of effective management.

To summarize, a good fit has been described as a healthy match between the worker's needs and the demands of the job (Blix, Cruise, Mitchell, & Blix, 1994). Not surprisingly, Blix and Lee (1991) reported a strong association between incidences of misfit and job change consideration in their study of occupational stress among university administrators. It is possible that a misfit between desired and actual work demands will result in

stress, job dissatisfaction, and an increased likelihood of job turnover (Fisher, 1994).

Criticisms of Person-Environment Fit Theory

Considerable research has been conducted on person-environment fit theory, most of which suggests a strong relationship between fit and job satisfaction. Edwards (1991), however, cautioned that problems in sampling, design, measurement, and analysis have rendered these findings inconclusive.

Organizational Climate Factors under Investigation

1. Internal communication. Internal communication was defined as the college's formal and informal communication processes and style. Open communication was found to be an essential element in motivating employees (Langley, 1994). As the life-blood of the organization, communication was the one "process that links the individual, the group, and the organization" (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991, p. 185). Stated another way, "Communication is the glue that holds an organization together and harmonizes its parts" (Hanson, 1985, p. 263). In organizations characterized by participative governance, high involvement, and open climates, streams of communication moved in all directions; consequently, it was incumbent on the leadership to consistently keep employees informed on issues that affect the organization. Because of their nature, horizontal communication was equally important, if not more important, than vertical communication (Lawler, 1992; Twombley & Amey,

1994). As earlier emphasized by Drucker (1974), "Downward communications cannot and do not work" (p.42).

Communication has been documented as a key contributor to climate (Deas, 1994; Kelly, 1988). Among other things, a communication system must include clear articulation of the college mission (National Symposium on Higher Education and Finance Issues in the 1990s, 1991; Wattenbarger, 1994), specific and attainable goals, and feedback on goal accomplishment (Johnson & Indvik, 1990). Quality communication is crucial given the magnitude of change that is occurring in organizations today (Ginsburg, 1994b). In a 1993 national study of attitudes in the workforce cited by Ginsberg, open communication was the most frequently cited reason why respondents had accepted their current positions.

2. <u>Organizational structure</u>. Organizational structure was defined as the college's administrative operation, or its hierarchial lines of authority and requirements for operating within that hierarchy. Organizational structures in community colleges have evolved in a variety of ways, emerging from branches of public school systems or independent districts governed by local boards of trustees, or any of a myriad of other configurations (Cohen & Brawer, 1994). What all organizations have in common, however, is that they are open systems (Katz & Kahn, 1978), described as such because of the natural flow of activity that consistently moved in and out of the organization. Educational institutions have been further characterized as

loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1991). Loose coupling means that various sub-units within the organization have their own identity, functions, and boundaries; they operate independently in many respects, even though they are related to the whole. Loose coupling makes it possible for some parts to be innovative even if others are not. At the same time, if one sub-unit breaks down, the entire organization is not likely to suffer the consequences.

As community college leaders prepare their organizations for the next century, it will be important that they envision more than a hierarchical structure bound by a set of procedures (Twombley & Amey, 1994). Similarly, Bing and Dye (1992) have argued that although hierarchical systems are powerful, and potentially effective in organizations such as the military, they are not appropriate for education. Rieley (1992) developed a process-based organizational structure, circular in design, with the nucleus/leadership directly connected to each facet of the organization. According to Rieley, such a design facilitated an environment for effective leadership through high connectivity. The network model of organization, proposed by Katz and West (1992) is another way of eliminating layers of hierarchy through decentralization, enhanced use of lateral relationships, and reliance on emergent information technology. In network organizations, responsibility and authority are delegated to the lowest level.

3. <u>Political climate</u>. Political climate was defined as the nature and complexity of the college's internal politics, or the degree to which an employee must operate within a political framework in order to accomplish his or her tasks. Organizations vary according to the extent to which the organizational climate is dominated by power struggles; accordingly, political climate affects work attitudes as well as organizational climate in general (Orpen, 1994; Schneider, 1975). College leaders function within a political arena that encompasses public relations, coalitions (both formal and informal), interinstitutional collaboration, and image in the process of decision-making (Cohen & Brawer, 1994). There has been no universal agreement on the role and importance of political climate; some experts have stressed that political behavior was the critical key to advancement and success in an organization, while others have ignored its existence (Stevens, 1990).

Mintzberg (1989), classified politics as a general force in all organizations that should be both accepted and understood. By its nature, politics is controversial; when differences and scarce resources are the norm, conflict is inevitable and power becomes a key resource. In organizations where power is concentrated at the top, the visible presence of political climate is diminished, although it frequently functions very actively in an underground fashion (Bolman & Deal, 1991). In associating politics with power, Mintzberg characterized politics as an

illegitimate system within the organization, although he also acknowledged that politics can play a very positive and functional role by (a) correcting deficiencies in the legitimate systems, (b) ensuring that all sides of an issue are fully debated, (c) stimulating necessary change, and (d) easing the execution of important decisions.

In spite of its positive potential, not all employees were comfortable with the negative connotations of the political structure of an organization. Levy (1989) reported that political climate was a recurring source of dissatisfaction among community college mid-level administrators, particularly those in instructional affairs.

To summarize, interdependence, differences, scarce resources, and power relationships all have an affect on the political climate in an organization. As noted by Bolman and Deal (1991), "It is naive and romantic to hope that politics can be eliminated from organizations. Managers can, however, learn to understand and manage political processes" (p. 190).

    4. <u>Professional development opportunities</u>.
Professional development opportunities was defined as the opportunities for employees to pursue and participate in activities to enhance job performance. In a labor intensive industry such as higher education (Ginsberg, 1994a), professional development is essential. In a study of Texas community college faculty, Hutton and Jobe (1985) reported that an absence of opportunities for professional

development was a key source of dissatisfaction, an
assertion acknowledged by Langley (1994) when he reported
that fostering employee growth and development was an
effective way to motivate employees. Franklin (1991) also
reported a relationship between professional development and
professional initiative in the faculty setting.

One of the responsibilities of leadership is to ensure
that the followers grow as persons (Harlacher &
Gollattscheck, 1994). This challenge was consistent with
the identification of growth as a motivator as established
by Herzberg et al. (1959). Opportunities for professional
development in the workplace not only increased proficiency,
but enhanced the likelihood that employees would qualify for
positions of advanced responsibility and salary in the
future (Wattenbarger, 1994). Parnell (1990) called for
greater attention to be given to staff development for all
employees as a means of improving instructional quality in
community colleges. If quality is affected by climate, then
Deas' (1994) report that investment in professional
development for all college constituents contributed
positively to the climate of the organization has
significance for colleges concerned with institutional
effectiveness and quality. Companies that invest in their
employees through professional development have shown that
they are able to retain employees more successfully, which
ultimately saves money for the organization. A basic tenet
of Total Quality Management (TQM) was the commitment to

training and development of employees (Ewell, 1993;
Wattenbarger, 1994).

    5. _Evaluation_. Evaluation was defined as the
college's procedures for evaluating employees through
positive feedback intended to provide professional growth
for the employee (Halpin, 1966). In emphasizing the
importance of regular employee evaluations, Langley (1994)
noted that such a process openly communicated the
organization's standards for quality. Although celebrating
employees' achievements was an essential element of a
healthy organization, its significance is vastly diminished
if a positive system of evaluation is not in place. Langley
also reported that pay systems based on job evaluations are
advantageous because they help companies compare their
salary scales with the market in general, a practice that
fosters a sense of equity among some employees. Critics of
pay systems based on job evaluations, however, have charged
that they are part of a bureaucratic ploy to control and
manipulate pay scales. Building strong internal
communications and trust among employees is one way to
positively influence how employees perceive evaluations
(Bolman & Deal, 1991).

    6. _Promotion_. Promotion was defined as the college's
commitment to internal promotion and advancement from within
the organization. Inherent in the concept of a positive
employee evaluation was the belief that promotions and pay
increases were both possible and likely. In a 1993 national

study on attitudes in the workforce cited by Ginsberg
(1994b), advancement opportunity was cited in 37% of the
surveys as a "very important" reason for accepting one's
current position. In the same survey, 22% respondents
identified advancement as a component of their definition of
success.

7. <u>Regard for personal concern</u>. Regard for personal
concern was defined as the college's sensitivity to and
regard for the personal concerns and well-being of employees
(Duncan & Harlacher, 1994; Vroom, 1982). Referred to by
Thor (1994) as the human side of quality, regard for
personal concern was cited as an essential element in all
organizations: "An organization can never neglect [this]
component of a quality effort without fatal consequences"
(p. 367). Regard for personal concern has been associated
with a high relationship leader style (Hersey & Blanchard,
1988). In a study of chief instructional officers, Uziogwe
(1994) identified the high task, high relationship leader
style as the style most common among this group.

<div align="center">The Redundancy Issue</div>

Recognizing the similarity in concepts discussed in the
literature pertaining to job satisfaction and organizational
climate, it is important to address the issue of anticipated
redundancy. Guion (1973) and Johannesson (1973) argued that
such a similarity in concepts made it difficult if not
impossible to study the relationship that exists between
them. In other words, too many of the same qualities and

issues appeared in each of these constructs, in spite of the
fact that the constructs themselves are different.
Specifically, the concern was that the overlap in content of
the two theories made it difficult to distinguish one
concept from the other. Furthermore, Johannesson claimed
that it was difficult for a person to separate his or her
personal feelings of job satisfaction from perceptions of
organizational climate.

The argument concerning redundancy was successfully
contested, however, through systematic research conducted by
Downey, Hellriegel, Phelps, and Slocum (1974) and LaFollette
and Sims (1975). The essential point in resolving the
redundancy issue, as reported by Payne, Fineman, and Wall
(1976) and Schneider and Snyder (1975), was that job
satisfaction consisted of an evaluative appraisal for one's
job, while organizational climate reflected employee
perceptions of the organization in general. Although there
is still some discussion about redundancy, researchers
generally agree that job satisfaction and organizational
climate have been established as two separate and distinct
concepts.

The study of the relationship between organizational
climate and job satisfaction has also included questions
about causality. Researchers have sought to determine if
climate as perceived by employees caused satisfaction, or if
job satisfaction in employees resulted in a positive
organizational climate. The outcomes of research on this

topic generally indicated that climate is much more likely to be the cause of job satisfaction than to be caused by it (Dieterly & Schneider, 1974; Litwin & Stringer, 1968).

Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction in Higher Education Settings

As loosely coupled (Weick, 1991), open systems (Katz & Kahn, 1978), educational institutions pose a unique set of circumstances that deserve special examination within the context of organizational climate and job satisfaction theories. Wattenbarger (1994) reported that developing an organizational spirit, or climate, is an important way for a chief executive officer to demonstrate support for the faculty and staff. A number of important factors, such as leader style, the nature of relationships among peers, nature of the job, structure of the organization, and reward systems, have been identified as contributing to climate in an organization (Vroom, 1982). The relationship between leader style and climate was confirmed by Litwin and Stringer (1968).

Groseth (1978) reported that the Herzberg theory was applicable to discreet positions within departments of student affairs in community colleges, however, he added that the hygiene factors of salary, personal life, status and job security, as well as the motivation factor of opportunity for advancement were essentially unimportant to this group of professionals. Burr (1980) also reported that Herzberg's two factor theory could be appropriately applied to specific student affairs positions in both the community

college and university settings. Jaeger and Tesh (1989), however, reported that Herzberg's theory did not adequately explain the dimensions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among practicing counselors. Austin's (1991) research verified the importance of intrinsic aspects, such as autonomy and working with interesting people, as key contributors to job satisfaction.

Historically, community college faculty have been found to be generally satisfied with their positions, with student achievement accounting for the greatest level of satisfaction, and lack of student participation and apathy accounting for most low satisfaction ratings (Hutton & Jobe, 1985). In an examination of job satisfaction among full-time faculty in California, Carleo (1989) reported that the lowest satisfaction rates were attributed to the physical work environment and the highest satisfaction rates were attributed to peer relationships. Another key contributor to satisfaction was discovered by Milosheff (1990), who determined that the more faculty perceived students to be appreciative, interested, and well prepared for college, the more faculty were likely to be satisfied with their jobs.

Scorsone (1990) and McKee (1991) both examined the relationship between leader style and organizational climate. McKee reported that the leadership style of presidents as perceived by the faculty affected the level of faculty job satisfaction. If the leader style of the president affects faculty job satisfaction, then the leader

style of the chief instructional officer will also affect faculty satisfaction. Conversely, given the importance of supervisor-supervisee relationships (Milosheff, 1990), it is also possible that satisfaction among the faculty will affect satisfaction in the chief instructional officer.

Rollins (1972) reported a positive association between openness of climate and job satisfaction among all employees in the North Carolina community college system. Smith (1989) also reported a positive relationship between climate and satisfaction in her study of community college faculty.

The Role of the Chief Instructional Officer in the Community College

Academic programs and teaching represent the core of community college life (Myran & Howdyshell, 1994), and quality instruction has been celebrated as the hallmark of the community college movement (O'Banion, 1994). Accordingly, faculty are situated at the center of teaching and learning activities at the community college (Milosheff, 1990). As the administrator most closely affiliated with the faculty and the curriculum, the chief instructional officer holds critical responsibility for ensuring that the academic mission of the college is effectively carried out, and for delivering quality educational programs to students (Vaughan, 1990). How the community college chief instructional officers perceive organizational climate at their respective institutions has implications for determining their own job satisfaction, and for affecting satisfaction among the faculty.

Glick (1992), in her study of academic administrators in selected colleges and universities, reported relatively high levels of job dissatisfaction among the chief instructional officers and deans, as compared with all administrators, and as compared with comparable administrators in other organizational settings. She reported that the source of dissatisfaction came from the content of their jobs, although no further conclusions could be drawn from her study.

Increased fiscal constraints and demands for accountability are commonly cited as sources of job dissatisfaction among faculty (Milosheff, 1990). As previously discussed, it is possible that faculty dissatisfaction contributes to stress and dissatisfaction among chief instructional officers. In a separate but related issue, research conducted by Hutton & Jobe (1985) revealed that job satisfaction in faculty may directly impact student achievement.

Other Factors That May Affect Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate

Recognizing that a myriad of other factors may influence the relationship between measures of job satisfaction and measures of organizational climate for community college chief instructional officers, the researcher also reviewed the literature for pertinent information on classification of the community college, gender and ethnicity, years of experience as an

administrator, and collective bargaining in community colleges.

Gender and Ethnic Differences

Researchers such as Gilligan (1982), North (1991), and Shakeshaft (1987) have documented differences in the leadership styles of men and women. There is no best way to lead or manage; in fact it is more accurate to say that different situations require different strategies and styles in order to be effective (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988), and that leadership teams composed of a members with different styles are likely to help their organizations be more effective.

More recently, Talbert-Hersi (1991), Hersi (1993), and Gillett-Karam (1991) have more closely examined issues concerning women and minorities in higher education. In 1991, Hersi reported that the major sources of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction for women in higher education stemmed from (a) perceptions of the communication climate, (b) elements that contributed to chronic job stress, and (c) facets of work support, such as affiliation with colleagues. Upon closer examination of these issues, Hersi concluded that job stress for women in higher education administration resulted from negative aspects of the work environment in those areas. Consequences of such stress included heightened job dissatisfaction; increased absenteeism; and diminished motivation, morale and productivity.

Cassidy and Warren (1991), postulated that satisfaction was affected when men or women worked in status-inconsistent jobs. A status-inconsistent job was described as one that was dominated by members of the opposite gender. Although in recent decades women have come to occupy increasing numbers of status-inconsistent positions in management and the professions (Burris & Wharton, 1982; Reskin & Roos, 1987; Sokoloff, 1987), they remain in the minority in many of the higher-ranking, higher-salaried, and more powerful positions (Bielby & Baron, 1987). This is also true in higher education, where women have only minimal representation in the upper levels of administration. "Women continue to advance much less quickly than men, have lower average salaries than men, and are in less prestigious fields of study and academic institutions [than men]" (Hersi, 1993, p.29).

Cassidy and Warren's (1991) research on male and female college graduates who were working in both status consistent and status inconsistent jobs led them to conclude that status consistency is less important in predicting job satisfaction than is the type of occupation itself, suggesting that job stress is more a function of the job than of the gender of the person who fills the position. Studies by other researchers have also yielded evidence that gender is not a major factor in some work related issues (Kirby, 1987; Tranberg, Slane, & Ekeberg, 1993); however, Schonwetter, Dieter, Bond, and Perry (1993) reported that

gender as well as age were related to worker style and satisfaction in her study of women administrators.

Limited research has been conducted on potential ethnic differences relative to job satisfaction or perceptions of organizational climate. Torres and Kapes (1990, 1992), found few differences between Blacks and Hispanics in their study of work values and job satisfaction in potential minority community college leaders in community colleges, however, no comparison was made to other ethnic groups, a comparison which may be significant. For example, Dimpka (1991), recorded meaningful differences in both expectations and satisfaction when he compared Blacks and Whites while examining of the impact of organizational climate on managers in a retail environment.

Size/Classification of the Organization

The larger and more diverse the institution, the greater the pressures on the chief instructional officer (Tucker & Bryan, 1988). According to Katsinas (unpublished) no one to date has developed a precise method for classifying community colleges. Dickmeyer and Cirino (1992) published a report on comparative financial status in community colleges by organizing their national sample first into multi-campus and single campus districts and then by size, however, their method does not address the many variations that may be important when researchers are examining theories and trying to distinguish differences among community colleges. There is presently no universally

accepted system of classification, other than the Carnegie system, which offers no breakdown of the 1,367 community colleges in the United States. In an effort to stimulate dialogue on this subject, Katsinas is developing a system that distinguishes 14 separate classifications of community colleges. The categories and descriptions developed by Katsinas are listed below. It should be noted that these categories are broad generalizations intended to assist researchers in analyzing data on community colleges, and have not been written to isolate or typecast any particular type of institution.

1. <u>Rural community colleges</u>. Rural community colleges are typically single campus institutions with a single governing board, offering both vocational and transfer programs of study.

2. <u>Suburban community colleges</u>. These colleges typically serve citizens who live in on the perimeters of large cities. They attract fewer first-time-in-college students than most other community colleges, and typically offer high concentrations of liberal arts/transfer curricula, and vocational offerings that focus primarily on high tech.

3. <u>Urban/inner city community colleges</u>. As the name suggests, these colleges are located in inner cities and are likely to offer heavy concentrations of vocational and career education programs that are designed to train students for quick entry into the workforce.

4. <u>Metropolitan area district community colleges, centralized and decentralized</u>. This group of colleges can be described as groups of campuses within a specific geographic district, governed by a single governing board.

5. <u>Community colleges adjacent to residential universities</u>. These colleges are classified as a distinct type because of their tendency to focus on the transfer function and align themselves with the neighboring university. Often these community college students participate in academic programs at both institutions.

6. <u>Mixed community colleges</u>. A college that falls into this category may include any combination of the first five types of colleges listed.

7. <u>Hispanic-Serving Institutions (H-SIs)</u>. H-SIs are distinguished by an enrollment population that is at least 25% Hispanic. As such, these institutions receive a favorable status in keeping with the language of the 1992 reauthorization of the federal Higher Education Act of 1965. As of 1992, approximately 120 institutions fell into this category, according to the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities.

8. <u>Historically-Black two-year colleges</u>. Colleges in this category are those that were originally established to serve black citizens. Fourteen of the one hundred traditionally Black institutions identified by the Secretary of Education are classified as two-year colleges.

9. <u>Tribally-controlled community colleges</u>. Tribally-controlled community colleges have received this special designation via federal legislation passed in 1977, in an effort to improve the low participation rates of native Americans in higher education. According to Katsinas, there are presently 14 tribally-controlled community colleges that serve primarily native Americans.

10. <u>Transfer/General education only</u>. These colleges are typically private, however, some public colleges in this category do exist. There is considerable overlap with this classification and number 12 listed below.

11. <u>Technical education only</u>. Colleges classified as technical education only are generally known as technical colleges, and have, by virtue of their origins, always placed heavy emphasis on vocational and technical programs. North and South Carolina are examples of states whose two year colleges would be categorized this way.

12. <u>Private (non-profit/sectarian and non-profit/ non-sectarian) colleges</u>. Private colleges typically emphasize the two-year transfer function with a focus on the liberal arts. Most private colleges in this category are church-related.

13. <u>Proprietary colleges</u>. Also private, proprietary colleges were established with an apprenticeship-oriented focus, and were designed typically as post-secondary trade schools.

14. <u>Two-year colleges at four-year institutions</u> This category of college is distinguished by its governance system, created as a part of a larger university system within the state. This difference permeates the organizational structure as well as the mission of the institution.

<u>Years of Experience</u>

Years of experience was examined because of its potential relationship to burnout. Wright (1991), however, found no differences regarding not only years of experience, but also gender and ethnicity, when he examined competencies of chief instructional officers in public colleges in Texas. Similarly, Johnson (1993) found no differences when examining issues surrounding faculty burnout.

<u>Collective Bargaining</u>

Most researchers agree that faculty involvement in governance is critical to successful problem-solving in an organization (Miller, 1989). Franklin (1991) noted that although community college faculty are uniquely qualified and frequently desirous of accepting leadership roles, divisions between faculty and administration often limit opportunities for faculty to make important contributions within the college. It is possible that the decision of a community college faculty to unionize could affect relationships between faculty and administration, as well as the relationship between the faculty and the chief instructional officer. Birnbaum (1989) examined the

relationship of collective bargaining to governance and found that bargaining is more likely to reflect previous campus relationships than to create new ones. More recently, Mech (1994) also reported that neither collective bargaining status nor gender was a significant factor in determining how organizational climate and personal characteristics affected managerial roles of chief instructional officers at comprehensive colleges and universities.

According to Miller (1989), although bureaucracy and rule-making have historically been viewed as distasteful attributes of the organization to most faculty, many have tended to be reluctant to embrace collective bargaining for fear that it would further reduce collegiality. In fact, one of the more commonly cited risks of unionization has been the possibility that it would provide the administration with an opportunity to claim that the faculty had relinquished its rights to a collaborative role in shared governance. In addition, administrators have been inclined to dislike collective bargaining because of restrictions that the language imposed on their rights as administrators, specifically with regard to faculty evaluations, poor language within the body of the contract, deficiencies in criteria procedures, and concerns about student evaluations (Andrews, 1991).

There is a considerably higher incidence of unionization in public colleges and universities than in

private institutions and also a higher incidence of
unionization in two-year colleges than in four year
colleges, with approximately 70% of all faculty being unions
located at two-year institutions (Annunziato, 1993; Douglas,
1988). Furthermore, independent bargaining agents are more
prevalent among community colleges than in other higher
education institutions (Annunziato, 1994). Research
conducted on two-year college faculty in the mid-west,
however, revealed that non-unionized faculty were more
satisfied than were their unionized counterparts on seven of
eight dimensions of the survey instrument (Finley, 1991).

<div align="center">Summary</div>

A wealth of information exists about the general nature
and complexity of job satisfaction and organizational
climate; interest in the subjects continues to remain high
as pressures for institutional effectiveness intensify
(Alfred & Kreider, 1991) and as employee expectations and
values change (Flynn, 1994; Katzell & Thompson, 1990).
Human potential is recognized as a valuable commodity in
most organizations, although the advent of high technology
has resulted in a perceived loss of identity for many staff
members. How well the executive leadership is able to mold
a positive organizational climate in the expanding global
arena will have profound effects on the success and well-
being of not only the employees but ultimately of entire
organizations. This is especially true in educational

institutions, where both the client and the product are human.

Community colleges are the largest and fastest growing segment of higher education in America (Boggs & Cater, 1994; El-Khawas, 1992; Witt et al., 1994); they provide access to postsecondary education for millions of citizens who otherwise might not pursue advanced education (Parnell, 1990). Increasingly, community colleges are being pressed to ensure quality by using new and more precise measures of institutional effectiveness (Alfred & Kreider, 1991). Community college chief instructional officers, as the cabinet level administrators who are most directly involved with teaching and learning, are challenged to communicate effectively, encourage scholarship, and promote high standards among the faculty ranks (Vaughan, 1990). Although chief instructional officers are not responsible for creating organizational climate, they must emulate the president in order to promote and strengthen the climate as established.

Glick (1992) reported that the annual turnover rate among chief instructional officers was 18.2%, a figure almost double the annual turnover rate for chief executives, and one of the highest rates of all administrators. Recognizing that job satisfaction is a deterrent to turnover, this exploration into the relationship between measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction in community college chief instructional

officers is both appropriate and timely. Chapter 3
describes the design of the study, including methodology,
the population, procedure for data collection,
instrumentation, statistical analysis, and reporting
procedures.

CHAPTER 3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of the relationship between measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction as applied to chief instructional officers in community colleges. A secondary purpose was to determine if there were significant differences in means for job satisfaction within the context of organizational climate when controlling for gender, ethnicity, classification of the community college by size, number of years experience as a college administrator, or collective bargaining status of the community college. Specifically, the research addressed five questions:

1. How do community college chief instructional officers perceive organizational climate at their respective institutions, using a set of seven identified factors for climate?

2. Using the same seven climate factors as an index, how satisfied are community college chief instructional officers with the organizational climate at their respective institutions?

3. How important is each of eight identified job satisfaction variables to community college chief

instructional officers in the performance of their specific
responsibilities?

4. For each of eight job satisfaction variables, is
there a significant relationship between measures of job
satisfaction and a set of seven measures of satisfaction
with the organizational climate, as reported by community
college chief instructional officers?

5. Is there a significant difference in the means of
eight job satisfaction variables for community college chief
instructional officers when compared by gender of the
respondent, ethnic origin of the respondent, classification
of the community college by size, length of time served as a
college administrator, and collective bargaining status of
the community college?

<u>Methodology</u>

To investigate the research questions listed above, a
survey was designed to collect information regarding
community college chief instructional officers' perceptions
of seven factors pertaining to organizational climate, their
levels of satisfaction with those factors, and how important
eight specific aspects of job satisfaction were in
fulfilling their roles as chief instructional officers. To
address questions 1, 2, and 3, data concerning perceptions
of climate, satisfaction with climate, and importance of job
satisfaction variables were recorded and analyzed to produce
a descriptive profile of community college chief
instructional officers. In addition, composites were

developed to reveal (a) how chief instructional officers as a group perceived organizational climate in community colleges, (b) how satisfied they were with the climate, and (c) how important each of eight job satisfaction variables were in the performance of their jobs as chief instructional officers. Multiple regression analysis was used to address questions 4 and 5. The use of multiple regression analysis enabled the researcher to examine the nature of the relationship between satisfaction with organizational climate and the importance of specific aspects of job satisfaction. Multiple regression analysis was also used to determine if differences in the measures of job satisfaction existed when controlling for gender of the respondents, ethnicity of the respondents, classification of the community college by size, length of time the respondents had served as college administrators, and collective bargaining status of the community college.

According to Lehman (1988), multiple regression analysis may be used for one of two different reasons. First, it may be used to establish the functional relationship between one dependent variable and a set of two or more independent variables. Secondly, it may be used to determine the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from a set of independent variables. The present research used multiple regression to analyze each of eight job satisfaction variables individually against a set of seven organizational climate

factors, to determine which organizational climate factor or factors had the most significant relationship with specific job satisfaction variables for chief instructional officers in community colleges. The multiple regression analysis method was used because of its potential for precisely predicting how organizational climate affects job satisfaction. The researcher hoped to determine if previously tested theories about the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction applied to chief instructional officers in community colleges.

The formula used for the multiple regression analysis was:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_k X_k + E$$

where:

    Y = Job Satisfaction dependent variable;

    β = the regression coefficient;

    X = Organizational Climate independent variable;

    k = number of independent variables (7); and

    E = random error

The Population

All chief instructional officers from member institutions of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) were invited to participate in the study. This population included 1060 chief instructional officers in community colleges in the United States. Support for the research was obtained from the National Council of

Instructional Administrators (NCIA), an affiliate council of
AACC. This support included assistance by the 1994 NCIA
Board of Directors in developing the survey instrument used
in conducting the research. A listing of the 1994 NCIA
Board appears in Appendix A.

Procedure for Data Collection

A letter of invitation to participate in the study was
sent to the chief instructional officer at each of the
member colleges of AACC. Included with the letter was a
copy of the survey and a self-addressed, postage paid return
envelope. The participants were asked to respond to the
survey within a four week period; the deadline for returning
the survey was included in both the cover letter and the
survey. Participants were also invited to request a copy of
the published results of the survey if they were interested.
To ensure an acceptable response rate, follow-up letters
were sent twice, the first time to the chief instructional
officers at 200 community colleges that were active members
of AACC, and the second time to chief instructional officers
at 50 community colleges that were active members of AACC.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument was developed from references in
the literature on job satisfaction and organizational
climate. In addition, instruments found in the original
works of Robert Barr (1988) and Sharon Gavin Levy (1989)
served as a basis for the design of the instrument.

Questions and definitions were derived from the works of the theorists and researchers reviewed in Chapter 2.

<u>Organizational climate factors</u>. A set of seven identified organizational climate factors were examined in the multiple regression analysis to determine their relationships to the importance of eight identified job satisfaction variables, as reported by chief instructional officers in community colleges. The organizational climate factors included

1. Internal communication, defined as the college's formal and informal processes and style;

2. Organizational structure, defined as the college's administrative operation, or its hierarchical lines of authority and requirements for operating within that hierarchy;

3. Political climate, defined as the nature and complexity of the college's internal politics, or the degree to which an employee must operate within a political framework in order to accomplish his or her tasks;

4. Professional development opportunities, defined as the opportunity for employees to pursue and participate in activities to enhance job performance;

5. Evaluation, defined as the degree to which the college's procedures for evaluating employees were perceived as fair and supportive;

6. Promotion, defined as the college's commitment to internal promotion and advancement from within the organization; and

7. Regard for personal concerns, defined as the college's sensitivity to and regard for the personal concerns and well-being of employees.

Job satisfaction variables. Eight job satisfaction variables were treated as dependent variables to determine their relationship to the seven organizational climate factors (independent variables) in a multiple regression equation. The job satisfaction variables identified for use in this study included

1. Participation in decision-making, defined as the college's process for decision-making and opportunities for involvement by the employee to participate in that process;

2. Autonomy, power, and control, defined as the amount or degree of jurisdiction or discretion that an employee is able to exercise while performing the tasks of his or her position;

3-5. Relationships with colleagues, defined as the quality of the affiliation that an employee maintains with each of three levels of colleagues: peers, subordinates, and supervisor;

6-7. Salary and benefits, defined as the equity and adequacy of both the salary and the benefits package received by an employee; and

8. Professional effectiveness, defined as the perceived overall effectiveness of the employee in his or her position.

The survey also included questions regarding the chief instructional officer's overall satisfaction with his or her position and overall satisfaction with his or her college. These questions were designed to validate the composite of categorical responses regarding job satisfaction and organizational climate.

An initial draft of the survey instrument was reviewed by the Board of Directors of the National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA) at their meeting in December, 1994. Revisions were made based on their input, further research, and the advice from the researcher's supervising committee. The instrument was then field tested to ensure consistency, reliability and validity.

To complete the validation process, the researcher asked nine (9) community college professionals to complete Part I of the instrument on two separate occasions. Eight of the nine individuals participated fully in the field test. Validity and reliability were checked by analyzing the participant responses to each of the 21 questions in Part I of the instrument, to be sure that a range of responses was present. Consistency was confirmed by comparing the responses received from the first administration of the field test to responses received in the second administration of the field test for all eight

participants. A Pearson product moment correlation analysis affirmed that a variety of responses could be obtained when using the instrument, that the questions posed were clear and understandable, and that suitable correlations between the first and second set of responses were present. Final adjustments to the instrument were made based on the field test experience as well as other recommendations made by the researcher's committee chair. A summary of field test data are located in Appendix B. A table of correlation coefficients for the first and second administrations of the field test are located in Appendix C. The final version of the survey instrument can be found in Appendix D, and the cover letter that accompanied the survey is shown in Appendix E.

Statistical Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the nature of the relationship between measures of job satisfaction and measures of satisfaction with organizational climate as reported by community college chief instructional officers. The data yielded information about which organizational climate factors or factors were significantly related to each of the eight variables associated with job satisfaction for community college chief instructional officers.

Multiple regression analysis was also used to determine if the means for job satisfaction within the context of organizational climate factors varied while controlling for

the demographic variables of gender, ethnicity, years of experience as a college administrator, classification of the community college by size, and collective bargaining status. Some of demographic categories that appeared in the original survey were not included in this analysis due to the small numbers of respondents who selected those categories.

Reporting Procedures

A total of 539 (51%) of the surveys were returned, coded, and analyzed to complete this research. Based on demographic information provided by the respondents, a profile of the community college chief instructional officer was developed. In addition, the data yielded composites of chief instructional officers' perceptions of organizational climate, their satisfaction with organizational climate and how important each of eight job satisfaction variables was in their positions as chief instructional officer.

Summary

The theories and constructs of job satisfaction and organizational climate have been investigated for over five decades. As research has advanced, the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate has become well established in a variety of work environments, although few investigations have been conducted in educational settings. This study tested the theories and constructs of job satisfaction and organizational climate as they applied to community college chief instructional officers. The profile of the community college chief instructional officer,

composites of their perceptions of organizational climate, satisfaction with organizational climate, and how important job satisfaction variables are to them in their jobs as chief instructional officers, as well as the results of the multiple regression analyses are reported in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of the relationship between measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction as applied to chief instructional officers in community colleges. A secondary purpose was to determine if there were significant differences in the means for job satisfaction within the context of organizational climate when controlling for gender, ethnicity, classification of the community college by size, number of years experience as a college administrator, and the collective bargaining status of the community college. Specifically, the research addressed five questions:

1. How do community college chief instructional officers perceive organizational climate at their respective institutions, using a set of seven identified factors for climate?

2. Using the same seven climate factors as an index, how satisfied are community college chief instructional officers with the organizational climate at their respective institutions?

3. How important is each of eight identified job satisfaction variables to community college chief

instructional officers in the performance of their specific job responsibilities?

4. For each of eight job satisfaction variables, is there a significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and a set of seven measures of satisfaction with organizational climate, as reported by community college chief instructional officers?

5. Is there a significant difference in the means of eight job satisfaction variables for community college chief instructional officers when compared by gender of the respondent, ethnic origin of the respondent, classification of the community college by size, length of time served as a college administrator, and collective bargaining status of the community college?

<div align="center">Survey Responses</div>

A total of 1,060 surveys were mailed to chief instructional officers at community colleges that were 1994 members of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). A total of 539 useable surveys were returned, rendering a 51% rate of return. A small proportion of the surveys were returned with some responses missing; however, all recorded responses were used in the analysis of data.

Recipients of the survey were provided with a postage paid envelope to insure anonymity.

Population Profile

Gender and Ethnicity

Tables 1 through 3 provide gender and ethnic distributions for community college chief instructional officers. A total of 530 participants completed the survey question on gender. Of these, 353 (66.6%) were male and 177 (33.4%) were female. Four-hundred-seventy-six chief instructional officers, representing 89.6% of the respondents, were white. Blacks and Hispanics each represented less than 4% of the total, with 20 and 18 respondents (3.8% and 3.4%), respectively. The remaining 2.9% of the respondents included all other ethnic groups. As noted in Table 3, only four gender/ethnic combinations were significantly represented in the population. Because these four groups represented 94.34% of the total respondents, the data analysis for research question 5 was performed using only these groups.

Classification of Community Colleges

Table 4 shows the distribution of community college chief instructional officers by classification of community college. Five-hundred-twenty-three respondents completed the survey question regarding community college classification. Although there appeared to be some confusion about this question, likely because it is a new concept, the information was useful in determining how chief instructional officers classify their own colleges, given the wide selection of choices.

Table 1

Community College Chief Instructional Officers: Distribution by Gender

Gender	n	%
Male	353	66.6
Female	177	33.4
Total	530	100.0

Table 2

Community College Chief Instructional Officers: Distribution by Ethnic Origin

Ethnic origin	n	%
Black/African American	20	3.8
Hispanic	18	3.4
White/Caucasian	476	89.6
All other	17	3.2
Total	522	100.0

Table 3

Community College Chief Instructional Officers: Distribution by Gender and Ethnic Origin

Gender & Ethnic Origin	n	%
White Male	323	60.95
White Female	151	28.49
Black Female	13	2.45
Hispanic Male	13	2.45
All other	30	5.66
Total	530	100.00

Table 4

Community College Chief Instructional Officers: Distribution
by Classification of Community College

Classification	n	%
Rural	219	41.9
Suburban	109	20.8
Urban/Inner City	27	5.2
Metropolitan	56	10.7
CC adjacent to residential	12	2.3
Any mix of 1-5	47	9.0
Hispanic-Serving Institution	6	1.1
Historically Black Two Yr.	3	0.6
Tribally Controlled	3	0.6
Transfer/Gen. Ed. Only	1	0.2
Technical Ed. Only	16	3.1
Private (non-profit, sect. or non-sect.)	4	0.8
Proprietary	0	0.0
Two year located on a 4 year campus	20	3.8
Total	523	100.0

The majority of chief instructional officers (n = 470
or 89.9%) used one of the first six classifications listed
on the survey. These classifications generally referred to
geographic location, thereby inferring the size of the
community college. Those classifications included (a)
rural, (b) suburban, (c) urban/inner city, (d) metropolitan
area district, centralized or decentralized, (e) community
college adjacent to a residential university, or (f) any
combination of the first five classifications. Of these six
classifications, 219 (41.9%) of the total respondents

identified themselves as working in rural community colleges.

Because the majority of respondents used one of the first six classifications to identify their colleges, only these six were used in analyzing the data in research question 5.

Number of Years Served as a College Administrator

Table 5 shows the distribution of community college chief instructional officers according to the number of years served as a college administrator. A total of 532 respondents answered this survey question. Of these, 242 (45.5%) reported having been a college administrator for 15 or more years, and sixteen (3%) reported having been a college administrator for less than one year.

Table 5

Community College Chief Instructional Officers: Distribution by Number of Years Experience as a College Administrator

Years experience	n	%
Less than 1 year	16	3.0
1-5 years	66	12.4
6-10 years	108	20.3
11-14 years	100	18.8
15 years or more	242	45.5
Total	532	100.0

Collective Bargaining Status

Table 6 delineates the collective bargaining statuses for both faculty and administrators as reported by community

Table 6

Community College Chief Instructional Officers: Distribution by Collective Bargaining Status of Faculty and Administrators

Faculty Collective Bargaining

Response	n	%
Yes	235	44.3
No	295	55.7
Total	530	100.0

Administrator Collective Bargaining

Response	n	%
Yes	39	7.4
No	488	92.6
Total	527	100.0

Faculty and Administrator Collective Bargaining
Same Unit

Response	n	%
Yes	5	13.5
No	32	86.5
Total	37	100.0

college chief instructional officers. A total of 530 and
527 chief instructional officers responded to these survey
questions, respectively. Of these, nearly half (n = 235 or
44.3%) of the chief instructional officers reported the
existence of a collective bargaining unit that speaks for
the faculty at their college, and slightly more than half (n
= 295 or 55.7%) reported that there was no such unit at
their college. Regarding whether or not collective
bargaining existed for administrators, the majority of
respondents (n = 488 or 92.6%) reported that there was no
collective bargaining unit representing administrators on
their campus. A small percentage (n = 39 or 7.4%) of the
chief instructional officers reported the existence of a
collective bargaining unit for administrators, however,
several of those respondents qualified their answers by
noting that the unit did not speak for cabinet level
administrators such as themselves. Of those who responded
affirmatively to the presence of collective bargaining units
for both faculty and administrators, only five stated that
the units were one and the same, while 32 reported that the
units were not one and the same. Because of the limited
numbers of administrative collective bargaining units that
were reported in community colleges, the data in research
question 5 was analyzed using only the information regarding
faculty collective bargaining status of the community
college.

Current Position Title

Respondents were asked to write in their current position title on the survey. The most frequently noted titles reported by community college chief instructional officers were dean and vice president. In many cases the terms instructional or academic affairs were also included in the titles. Other titles mentioned were Vice Chancellor, Executive Dean, and Assistant or Associate Vice President. Some titles reflected the additional responsibility for student affairs.

Research Question 1

The seven organizational climate factors under investigation included (a) internal communication, (b) organizational structure, (c) political climate, (d) professional development opportunities, (e) evaluation, (f) promotion, and (g) regard for personal concerns. The organizational climate factors were coded as follows:

IC = Perception of Internal Communication;

OS = Perception of Organizational Structure;

PCL = Perception of Political Climate;

PDO = Perception of Professional Development
    Opportunities;

EVAL = Perception of Evaluation;

PROMO = Perception of Promotion; and

RPC = Perception of Regard for Personal Concerns.

Ratings for perceptions of organizational climate were recorded on a scale of one to five, with five being the

maximum response rating and one being the minimum response rating. The rating of five was interpreted to signify a very high level of existence of the organizational climate factor in question. The rating of four was interpreted to signify a high level of existence of the factor. The rating of three was interpreted to signify a moderately high level of existence; the rating of two was interpreted to signify a low level of existence of the factor. The rating of one was interpreted to signify a very low level of existence of the factor.

Tables 7 through 9 provide composites of the community college chief instructional officers' perceptions of organizational climate at their colleges. The three organizational climate factors that received the highest mean ratings were regard for personal concerns (RPC), professional development opportunities (PDO), and internal communication (IC). The mean score for RPC was 4.166, with a large majority (n = 440 or 81.6%) of the community college chief instructional officers rating RPC as either four or five, and 241 respondents (44.7%) rated this aspect of organizational climate as five, the highest possible rating. These data suggest that community college chief instructional officers generally believe that they work in an environment that is characterized by a concern for their personal welfare.

The other organizational climate factors that received high ratings were professional development opportunities

Table 7

Community College Chief Instructional Officers'
Perceptions of Organizational Climate: Frequency
Distributions

Factor		Ratings					Totals
		5	4	3	2	1	
IC							
	n	120	283	108	26	1	538
	%	22.3	52.6	20.1	4.8	0.02	100
CC							
	n	88	215	175	54	5	537
	%	16.4	40.0	32.6	10.1	0.9	100
PCL							
	n	117	151	156	95	20	539
	%	21.7	28.0	28.9	17.6	3.7	100
PDO							
	n	210	166	103	48	12	539
	%	39.0	30.8	19.1	8.9	2.2	100
EVAL							
	n	126	202	140	42	20	530
	%	23.8	38.1	26.4	7.9	3.8	100
PROMO							
	n	82	206	177	61	13	539
	%	15.2	38.2	32.8	11.3	2.4	100
RPC							
	n	241	199	60	26	13	539
	%	44.7	36.9	11.1	4.8	2.4	100

IC = Perception of Internal Communication
OS = Perception of Organizational Structure
PCL = Perception of Political Climate
PDO = Perception of Professional Development Opportunities
EVAL = Perception of Evaluation
PROMO = Perception of Promotion
RPC = Perception of Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 8

Community College Chief Instructional Officers' Perceptions
of Organizational Climate Mean Distributions

Factor	N	Mean	SD	StdErr
IC	538	3.920	0.792	0.034
OS	537	3.608	0.907	0.391
PCL	539	3.463	1.122	0.483
PDO	539	3.953	1.066	0.045
EVAL	530	3.701	1.035	0.044
PROMO	539	3.525	0.962	0.041
RPC	539	4.166	0.970	0.041

IC = Perception of Internal Communication
OS = Perception of Organizational Structure
PCL = Perception of Political Climate
PDO = Perception of Professional Development Opportunities
EVAL = Perception of Evaluation
PROMO = Perception of Promotion
RPC = Perception of Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 9

Community College Chief Instructional Officers' Perceptions of Organizational Climate:
Correlation Table

	IC	OS	PCL	PDO	EVAL	PROMO	RPC
IC	1.0000	0.1369	-0.1993*	0.2905	0.3486	0.2942	0.3244
OS	0.1369	1.0000	0.1318	0.0255	0.0762	0.1029	0.0385
PCL	-0.1993*	0.1318	1.0000	-0.1621*	-0.2468*	-0.1054*	-0.2008*
PDO	0.2905	0.0255	-0.1621*	1.0000	0.4061	0.2864	0.3756
EVAL	0.3486	0.0762	-0.2468*	0.4061	1.0000	0.3329	0.4417
PROMO	0.2942	0.1029	-0.1054*	0.2864	0.3329	1.0000	0.3277
RPC	0.3244	0.0385	-0.2008*	0.3756	0.4417	0.3277	1.0000

* = negative correlations with Political Climate

IC = Perception of Internal Communication
OS = Perception of Organizational Structure
PCL = Perception of Political Climate
PDO = Perception of Professional Development Opportunities
EVAL = Perception of Evaluation
PROMO = Perception of Promotion
RPC = Regard for Personal Concerns

(PDO) and internal communications (IC), as reflected by the mean scores of 3.953 and 3.920, respectively. A total of 376 community college chief instructional officers (69.8%) assigned a rating of four or five to PDO and a total of 403 respondents (74.9%) rated internal communication with a four or five. These data indicated that in general, community college chief instructional officers worked in an environment characterized by ample opportunities for professional development as well as open communications.

Political climate (PCL) received the lowest mean rating of all the perceptions of organizational climate (3.463). This is noteworthy for several reasons. First, a high rating on PCL might not always be interpreted as the most favorable scenario. In other words, according to the definition of PCL, a rating of five on this aspect of organizational climate signified that the chief instructional officer perceived that the college's internal politics were very complex, and that it was necessary for employees to operate strategically within that political framework in order to accomplish their tasks. That a relatively low number (n = 268 or 49.7%) of respondents assigned a rating of four or five to PCL and a total of 115 respondents rated PCL with either a one or two would indicate that in general, community college chief instructional officers did not believe the level and complexity of internal politics to be high. The second reason that the PCL rating is noteworthy is because of how

this factor is correlated with the other organizational climate factors. This information appears in Table 9 and is discussed later in this chapter.

Although perceptions of evaluation (EVAL) were generally high, as reflected by the mean of 3.701, more respondents made notations about evaluation on the survey than they did about any other item. Most comments referred to the fact that no evaluation system existed at their college. Evaluation was defined as the degree to which the college's procedures for evaluating employees was perceived as fair and supportive.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for the perception of organizational climate scores are shown in Table 9. A correlation of 0.45 or better was considered noteworthy, given the large sample size. As shown in the table, no correlations could be considered strong; however, a negative correlation existed between political climate (PCL) and all other organizational climate factors except organizational structure (OS). This negative correlation was interpreted to mean that as perceptions of political climate decreased, perceptions of internal communication, professional development opportunities, evaluation, promotion and regard for personal concern increased for community college chief instructional officers.

Research Question 2

The second research question examined community college chief instructional officers' satisfaction with

organizational climate. Analysis of the data for research question 2 rendered a descriptive composite of how satisfied community college chief instructional officers were with organizational climate. Coding of the satisfaction ratings for the seven organizational climate factors followed the same pattern as for perception ratings, but with the numeral 2 added as follows:

    IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication;

    OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure;

    PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate;

    PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development Opportunities;

    EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation;

    PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion; and

    RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns.

Ratings for satisfaction with organizational climate were recorded on a scale of one to five, with five being the maximum response rating and one being the minimum response rating. The rating of five was interpreted to signify that the chief instructional officer was highly satisfied. The rating of four was interpreted to signify that he or she was satisfied. The rating of three was interpreted to mean that the respondent was moderately satisfied with the organizational climate factor in question. The rating of two was interpreted to signify that the respondent was

unsatisfied, and the rating of one was interpreted to signify that he or she was very unsatisfied.

Satisfaction ratings for organization climate are shown in Tables 10 through 12. Consistent with the perceptions of community college chief instructional officers, the highest ratings for satisfaction with organizational climate factors were recorded in the categories of (a) regard for personal concern (RPC2/ mean score 4.176), (b) professional development opportunities (PDO2/ mean score 3.930), and (c) internal communication (IC2/ mean score 3.656). Satisfaction ratings for evaluation (EVAL2) and promotion (PROMO2) were also over 3.600.

A total of 426 (79.3%) of the community college chief instructional officers indicated that they were either satisfied or highly satisfied with regard for personal concerns (RPC2). Only 44 (8.2%) reported that they were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with RPC. These data are consistent with the 81.6% of respondents who reported perceptions of strong or very strong regard for personal concerns at their colleges and indicate that community college chief instructional officers are generally satisfied with the degree to which their colleges demonstrate a concern for their personal well-being.

A total of 380 respondents (70.6%) were either satisfied or highly satisfied with the professional development opportunities at their colleges. These data were also consistent with their reported perceptions of a high presence of professional development opportunities, as

Table 10

Community College Chief Instructional Officers' Satisfaction
with Organizational Climate: Frequency Distributions

Factor		Ratings				Totals
	5	4	3	2	1	
IC2						
n	101	234	133	57	13	538
%	18.8	43.5	24.7	10.6	2.4	100
OC2						
n	90	233	130	77	17	537
%	16.8	41.5	24.2	14.3	3.2	100
PCL2						
n	62	186	162	93	35	538
%	11.5	34.6	30.1	17.3	6.5	100
PDO2						
n	216	164	87	50	13	538
	40.1	30.5	16.2	9.3	3.9	100
EVAL2						
n	120	205	122	62	25	534
%	22.5	38.4	22.8	11.6	4.7	100
PROMO2						
n	121	188	152	60	16	537
%	22.5	35.0	28.3	11.2	3.0	100
RPC2						
n	260	166	67	34	10	537
%	48.4	30.9	12.5	6.3	1.9	100

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 11

Community College Chief Instructional Officers' Satisfaction
with Organizational Climate: Mean Distributions

Factor	N	Mean	SD	StdErr
IC2	538	3.656	0.979	0.422
OS2	537	3.543	1.030	0.044
PCL2	538	3.273	1.080	0.046
PDO2	538	3.93	1.133	0.048
EVAL2	534	3.623	1.095	0.047
PROMO2	537	3.629	1.043	0.045
RPC2	537	4.176	1.001	0.043

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
         Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 12

Community College Chief Instructional Officers' Satisfaction with Organizational Climate: Correlation Table

	IC2	OS2	PCL2	PDO2	EVAL2	PROMO2	RWP2
IC2	1.0000	0.5302	0.4619	0.3443	0.4519	0.3966	0.4331
OS2	0.5302*	1.0000	0.5219*	0.2570	0.3953	0.3811	0.3588
PCL2	0.4619*	0.5219*	1.0000	0.3578	0.4642	0.3542	0.4263
PDO2	0.3443	0.2570	0.3578	1.0000	0.4517*	0.4026	0.4078
EVAL2	0.4519*	0.3953	0.4642*	0.4517*	1.0000	0.4773	0.4374
PROMO2	0.3966	0.3811	0.3542	0.4026	0.4773*	1.0000	0.3993
RWP2	0.4331	0.3588	0.4263	0.4078	0.4374	0.3993	1.0000

* correlations greater than 0.45

IC2   = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2   = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

discussed in the analysis of research question 1. In general, community college chief instructional officers were content with the opportunities for professional development that exist for them at their colleges.

Three-hundred-thirty-five respondents (62.3%) reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with internal communications (IC2). Again, these data were consistent with community college chief instructional officers' perceptions of strong internal communication at their colleges. However, a total of 70 (13%) of the survey respondents reported that they were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with internal communication. These data suggested that although perception of internal communication was generally high, some chief instructional officers were decidedly not satisfied with this aspect of organizational climate at their colleges.

Community college chief instructional officers reported lower satisfaction with political climate (PCL2) than with any other aspect of organizational climate, with a mean rating of 3.272. Although almost half (n = 248 or 46.1%) reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with political climate, a total of 128 (23.8%) reported that they were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied PC, as shown in Table 10. Recognizing that community college chief instructional officers rated their perception of political climate as moderately high with a mean of 3.463, and also recognizing that a higher perception rating of political climate indicates a more complex internal political environment, the lower satisfaction ratings for political climate were

interpreted to mean that on average community college chief instructional officers were not satisfied when their college environment and on average it was characterized by a complex internal political climate. The data revealed that nearly one fourth of all community college chief instructional officers were dissatisfied with political climate.

Community college chief instructional officers reported that they were generally as satisfied with evaluations (EVAL2) as they were with internal communication, as evidenced by the mean satisfaction rating of 3.623. Although over half (n = 325 or 60.9%) of the community college chief instructional officers rated satisfaction with evaluation as four or five, just over 13.2% (n = 63) reported that they were either unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with evaluations. These data were fairly consistent with the perception ratings for evaluation, where a similar proportion (n = 62 or 11.7%) assigned a one or two to evaluations (EVAL). Generally, it appeared that if community college chief instructional officers perceived that the system of evaluation was fair and supportive, they were satisfied with evaluations.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for the satisfaction with organizational climate scores are shown in Table 12. A correlation coefficient of 0.45 or better was considered noteworthy due to the large sample size, and these instances were noted on the table. A general trend toward moderate associations among all organizational climate factors was found, with internal communication (IC2) and evaluation (EVAL2) showing consistently stronger

relationships with other factors. The correlation analysis
indicated that the organizational climate factors were all
interrelated to some extent.

Community college chief instructional officers were
asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their
colleges. The mean score for overall satisfaction with
college (OSWC) was 3.857, as noted in Table 13. A total of
105 (19.7%) rated themselves as highly satisfied, and an
additional 282 (53%) rated themselves as satisfied with
their colleges. These data reinforced the generally high
ratings for satisfaction with seven organizational climate
factors that were reported by survey respondents. Overall,
community college chief instructional officers were found to
be satisfied with the environments in which they work.

Table 13

Community College Chief Instructional Officers' Overall
Satisfaction with College: Frequency Distribution and Mean
Distribution

Frequency Distribution

Factor		Ratings				Totals
	5	4	3	2	1	
OSWC						
n	105	282	111	29	5	532
%	19.7	53.0	20.7	5.5	0.9	100

Mean Distribution

Factor	N	Mean	SD	StdErr
OSWC	532	3.851	0.829	0.035

OSWC = Overall Satisfaction with College

Research Question 3

The third research question examined how important eight job satisfaction variables were to community college chief instructional officers in the performance of their jobs. Analysis of the data for research question 3 rendered a composite of how important community college chief instructional officers believed each job satisfaction variable was in the performance of their tasks.

The job satisfaction variables under investigation included (a) participation in decision-making, (b) autonomy, power, control, (c) relationships with peers, (d) relationships with subordinates, (e) relationship with superior, (f) salary, (g) benefits, and (h) professional effectiveness, and were coded as follows:

DM = Importance of Participation in Decision-making;

APC = Importance of Autonomy, Power, Control;

RWP = Importance of Relationships with Peers;

RWSub = Importance of Relationships with Subordinates;

RWSup = Importance of Relationship with Supervisor;

SAL = Importance of Salary;

BENE = Importance of Benefits; and

PE = Importance of Professional Effectiveness.

Ratings for the importance of job satisfaction variables were recorded on a scale of one to five, with five being the maximum response rating and one being the minimum response rating. The rating of five was interpreted to signify very

important. The rating of four was interpreted to signify important. The rating of three was interpreted to signify moderately important. The rating of two was interpreted to signify unimportant. The rating of one was interpreted to signify very unimportant.

The importance ratings for the job satisfaction variables as reported by community college chief instructional officers are shown in Tables 14 through 16. All eight job satisfaction variables received high ratings by the respondents. Several points and distinctions, however, are worthy of special note.

First, five of the eight variables were rated as important or very important to over 92% of the respondents. The job satisfaction variables that received the highest importance ratings by community college chief instructional officers were (a) participation in decision-making (DM), and (b) professional effectiveness (PE). A total of 522 (97.2%) rated participation in decision-making as important or very important. The mean score for DM was 4.662; these data were very consistent with the literature. Also consistent were the ratings for the importance of professional effectiveness (mean score 4.555). Five-hundred-thirteen respondents (96.3%) rated DM as important or very important.

Of the three categories that encompassed relationships with colleagues, namely peers (RWP), subordinates (RWSub), and superordinates (RWSup), community college chief instructional officers rated relationships with peers as

Table 14

Importance of Job Satisfaction Variables to Community
College Chief Instructional Officers: Frequency
Distributions

Variable	Ratings					Totals
	5	4	3	2	1	
DM						
n	378	144	9	5	1	537
%	70.4	26.8	1.7	0.9	0.2	100
APC						
n	172	266	75	21	2	536
%	32.1	49.6	14.0	3.9	0.4	100
RWP						
n	261	233	28	11	0	533
%	49.0	43.7	5.3	2.1	0.0	100
RWSub						
n	294	206	28	5	0	533
%	55.2	38.6	5.3	0.9	0.0	100
RWSup						
n	350	158	23	2	0	533
%	65.7	29.6	4.3	0.4	0.0	100
SAL						
n	118	279	108	21	7	533
%	22.1	52.3	20.3	3.9	1.3	100
BENE						
n	153	268	94	11	2	528
%	29.0	50.8	17.8	2.1	0.4	100
PE						
n	317	196	19	1	0	533
%	59.5	36.8	3.6	0.2	0.0	100

DM = Importance of Participation in Decision-making
APC = Importance of Autonomy, Power, Control
RWP = Importance of Relationships with Peers
RWSub = Importance of Relationships with Subordinates
RWSup = Importance of Relationship with Supervisor
SAL = Importance of Salary
BENE = Importance of Benefits
PE = Importance of Professional Effectiveness

Table 15

Importance of Job Satisfaction Variables to Community
College Chief Instructional Officers: Mean Distributions

Factor	N	Mean	SD	StdErr
DM	537	4.662	0.579	0.025
APC	536	4.091	0.802	0.034
RWP	533	4.395	0.684	0.029
RWSub	533	4.480	0.641	0.027
RWSup	533	4.606	0.590	0.025
SAL	533	3.900	0.831	0.036
BENE	528	4.058	0.763	0.033
PE	533	4.555	0.574	0.024

DM = Importance of Participation in Decision-making
APC = Importance of Autonomy, Power, Control
RWP = Importance of Relationships with Peers
RWSub = Importance of Relationships with Subordinates
RWSup = Importance of Relationship with Supervisor
SAL = Importance of Salary
BENE = Importance of Benefits
PE = Importance of Professional Effectiveness

Table 16

Importance of Job Satisfaction Variables to Community College Chief Instructional Officers: Correlation Table

	DM	APC	RWP	RWSub	RWSup	SAL	BENE	PE
DM	1.0000	0.3199	0.2360	0.3279	0.3582	0.1259	0.0474	0.2661
APC	0.3199	1.0000	0.1632	0.1693	0.2196	0.1838	0.1544	0.1963
RWP	0.2360	0.1632	1.0000	0.4838*	0.4186	0.1946	0.2208	0.2079
RWSub	0.3279	0.1693	0.4838*	1.0000	0.4560*	0.0722	0.1400	0.2786
RWSup	0.3582	0.2196	0.4186	0.4560*	1.0000	0.1459	0.1316	0.2101
SAL	0.1259	0.1838	0.1946	0.0722	0.1459	1.0000	0.6745*	0.2224
BENE	0.0474	0.1544	0.2208	0.1400	0.1316	0.6745*	1.0000	0.2205
PE	0.2661	0.1963	0.2079	0.2786	0.2101	0.2224	0.2205	1.0000

* = significant relationship at p value of $< = 0.05$

DM = Importance of Participation in Decision-making
APC = Importance of Autonomy, Power, Control
RWP = Importance of Relationships with Peers
RWSub = Importance of Relationships with Subordinates
RWSup = Importance of Relationship with Supervisor
SAL = Importance of Salary
BENE = Importance of Benefits
PE = Importance of Professional Effectiveness

slightly less important than relationships with subordinates and the relationship with superordinate as slightly more important than relationships with subordinates. A total of 508 (95.3%) of the respondents assigned a rating of important or very important to RWSup.

The three job satisfaction variables considered least important to community college chief instructional officers were (a) salary (SAL), (b) benefits (BENE), and (c) autonomy, power, control (APC). In contrast to the higher importance ratings recorded for most other job satisfaction variables, only 397 respondents (74.4%) rated salary as important or very important. Benefits was found to be only slightly more important than salary, with 421 respondents (79.8%) rating it as important or very important. The relatively low importance ratings for both salary and benefits, evidenced by the mean scores of 3.900 and 4.058 respectively, were consistent with the information recorded in Chapter 2.

Less consistent with previous research was the relatively low importance rating for autonomy, power, control (APC). A relatively low number (n = 438 or 81.7%) of respondents rated APC as important or very important, and the mean importance rating of 4.091, was only slightly higher than the mean rating for BENE (4.058) as discussed above.

Although it was clear that all job satisfaction variables were important to community college chief

instructional officers, participation in decision-making
(DM), relationship with supervisor (RWSup), and professional
effectiveness (PE) were found to be the most important
variables to community college chief instructional officers,
as evidenced by the mean ratings of over 4.5 for each and
noted in Table 15. These data confirmed that community
college chief instructional officers were most concerned
with their relationships with their supervisors (RWSup),
their colleges' process for decision-making and the extent
to which they are involved in that process (DM), and also
how effective they were in fulfilling their roles as chief
instructional officer (PE).

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for the
job satisfaction variables are shown in Table 16. A
correlation of 0.45 or better was considered noteworthy due
to the large sample size. Not surprisingly, the strongest
relationship was found between salary (SAL) and benefits
(BENE), with a correlation coefficient of 0.6745. Other
noteworthy associations were found between (a) relationships
with peers (RWP) and relationships with subordinates
(RWSub), with a correlation coefficient of 0.4838; and (b)
RWSub and relationship with superior (RWSup), with a
correlation coefficient of 0.4560. These associations were
not surprising, given the amount of interaction that was
implied by the chief instructional officers' generally high
ratings for internal communication (IC).

The mean score for overall satisfaction with position (OSWP) as reported by community colleges chief instructional officers was 4.015. Table 17 shows the frequency and mean distributions for OSWP. A total of 436 (81.8%) rated themselves as satisfied or very satisfied with their positions. Given the high value placed on all job satisfaction variables as well as the generally high ratings for satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors and overall satisfaction with college (OSWC), these data strongly supported the assumption that a relationship between measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction does existed for community college chief instructional officers.

Table 17

Community College Chief Instructional Officers' Overall
Satisfaction with Position: Frequency Distribution and Mean
Distribution

Frequency Distribution

Variable			Ratings			Totals
	5	4	3	2	1	
OSWP						
n	131	305	75	18	4	533
%	24.6	57.2	14.1	3.4	0.8	100

Mean Distribution

Variable	N	Mean	SD	StdErr
OSWP	533	4.015	0.768	0.035

OSWP = Overall Satisfaction with Position

To summarize, the analysis of data for research
questions 1 through 3 revealed that as a group, community
college chief instructional officers were predominately
white males who had been in administrative positions for 15
or more years. Most classified their community colleges as
rural, and nearly half worked in institutions where the
faculty were unionized. As a group, community college chief
instructional officers rated regard for peers, concerns,
professional development opportunities, and internal
communications the highest. Likewise, they were most
satisfied with these three aspects of organizational
climate. All job satisfaction variables received high
importance ratings, particularly participation in decision
making, relationship with supervisor, and professional
effectiveness.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question examined the relationship
between the measures of job satisfaction and the measures of
satisfaction with seven organizational climate factors as
reported by community college chief instructional officers.

Table 18 provides the correlation coefficients for the
job satisfaction variables (DM, APC, RWP, RWSub, RWSup, SAL,
BENE, and PE) and the satisfaction ratings with
organizational climate (IC2, OS2, PCL2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2,
and RPC2). The correlation analysis was run to identify
particular areas of interest in the relationships between

Table 18

The Relationship Between Measures of Job Satisfaction and Measures of Organizational Climate: Correlation Table

	DM	APC	RWP	RWSub	RWSup	SAL	BENE	PE
IC2	0.1956	0.1612	0.0967	0.1512	0.2212	0.1307	0.0769	0.1030
OS2	0.1865	0.1516	0.0779	0.1090	0.2589	0.0663	0.1249	0.0538
PCL2	0.1340	0.1155	0.0451	0.0808	0.1175	0.0486	0.1043	0.0722
PDO2	0.0659	0.0292	0.0635	0.0889	0.1016	0.0477	0.0123	0.0538
EVAL2	0.0585	0.0579	0.0680	0.0506	0.1153	-0.0090	0.0320	0.0668
PROMO2	0.1456	0.0628	0.0693	0.1005	0.1595	-0.0053	0.0213	0.0344
RPC2	0.1482	0.1574	0.1038	0.0922	0.1602	0.1315	0.1111	0.1904

DM = Importance of Participation in Decision-making
APC = Importance of Autonomy, Power, Control
RWP = Importance of Relationships with Peers
RWSub = Importance of Relationships with Subordinates
RWSup = Importance of Relationship with Supervisor
SAL = Importance of Salary
BENE = Importance of Benefits
PE = Importance of Professional Effectiveness

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development Opportunities

EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

measures of job satisfaction and measures of organizational climate, however, as the table indicates, no strong associations were present.

Tables 19 through 26 show the analysis of eight job satisfaction variables to satisfaction with organizational climate factors as reported by community college chief instructional officers. Parameter estimates revealed that some organizational climate factors were associated negatively with the job satisfaction, as evidenced by the parameter estimates. Organizational climate variables with a p value of 0.05 or less were considered to have a significant relationship with the job satisfaction variable.

Decision-making

Table 19 shows the analysis of the relationship between participation in decision-making (DM) and satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors (IC2, OS2, PCL2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2). In this analysis, a significant relationship was found only between DM and IC2, as indicated by the p value of 0.0236. These data suggested that if internal communication was strong, the chief instructional officer was satisfied with his or her level of their participation in decision-making at the college.

Autonomy, Power, Control

Table 20 shows analysis of the relationship between autonomy, power, control (APC) and satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors IC2, OS2, PC2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2. In this analysis, significant

Table 19

Model Relating Importance of Participation in Decision-Making to Satisfaction with Organizational Climate

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	10.4577	4.658	.0001
Error	522	167.4309		
Total	529	177.8886		
R-Square	.0588			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for HO	p
Intercept	1	4.0070	31.602	.0001
IC2	1	0.0734	2.271	.0236*
OS2	1	0.0497	1.609	.1081
PCL2	1	0.0160	0.550	.5825
PDO2	1	−0.0128	−0.498	.6189
EVAL2	1	−0.0551	−1.894	.0588
PROMO2	1	0.0418	1.457	.1457
RPC2	1	0.0452	1.487	.1337

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
     Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 20

Model Relating Importance of Autonomy, Power, Control to
Satisfaction with Organizational Climate

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	14.9630	3.447	.0013
Error	521	323.1201		
Total	528	338.0831		
R-Square	.0443			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for HO	p
Intercept	1	3.4561	19.271	.0001
IC2	1	0.0821	1.825	.0685
OS2	1	0.0636	1.476	.1407
PCL2	1	0.0151	0.373	.7096
PDO2	1	-0.0454	-1.266	.2060
EVAL2	1	-0.0360	-0.889	.0374*
PROMO2	1	-0.0110	-0.276	.7825
RPC2	1	0.0988	2.350	.0191*

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
       Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 21

Model Relating Importance of Relationships with Peers to
Satisfaction with Organizational Climate

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	3.7590	1.167	.3202
Error	518	238.4006		
Total	525	242.1597		
R-Square	.0155			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for HO	p
Intercept	1	3.9857	25.503	.0001
IC2	1	0.0320	0.412	.4120
OS2	1	0.0148	0.399	.6902
PCL2	1	-0.0200	-0.569	.5694
PDO2	1	0.0105	0.340	.7342
EVAL2	1	0.0043	0.124	.9012
PROMO2	1	0.0032	0.096	.9238
RPC2	1	0.05717	1.559	.1195

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
      Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 22

Model Relating Importance of Relationships with Subordinates to Satisfaction with Organizational Climate

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	6.1669	2.162	.0361
Error	518	211.0592		
Total	525	217.2262		
R-Square	.0284			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for H0	p
Intercept	1	4.0021	27.276	.0001
IC2	1	0.0776	2.119	.0345*
OS2	1	0.0252	0.723	.4702
PCL2	1	-0.0020	-0.063	.9502
PDO2	1	0.0228	0.780	.4359
EVAL2	1	-0.0381	-1.149	.2511
PROMO2	1	0.0272	0.841	.4006
RPC2	1	0.0134	0.392	.6950

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
     Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 23

<u>Model Relating Importance of Relationship with Supervisor to</u>
<u>Satisfaction with Organizational Climate</u>

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	15.6373	4.892	.0001
Error	518	167.9006		
Total	525	183.5380		
R-Square	.0852			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for HO	p
Intercept	1	3.8672	31.551	.0001
IC2	1	0.0647	1.984	.0478*
OS2	1	0.1227	3.934	.0001*
PCL2	1	−0.0372	−1.260	.2081
PDO2	1	0.0039	0.151	.8804
EVAL2	1	−0.0197	−0.666	.0505
PROMO2	1	0.0288	0.998	.3188
RPC2	1	0.0330	1.079	.2812

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
      Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 24

Model Relating Importance of Salary to Satisfaction with
Organizational Climate

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	14.5500	3.062	.0036
Error	519	352.3190		
Total	526	366.8690		
R-Square	.0397			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for H0	p
Intercept	1	3.4165	18.042	.0001
IC2	1	0.1182	2.499	.0128*
OS2	1	0.0079	0.177	.8596
PCL2	1	-0.0101	-0.239	.8115
PDO2	1	0.0175	0.465	.0642
EVAL2	1	-0.0803	-1.880	.0606
PROMO2	1	-0.0612	-1.464	.1439
RPC2	1	0.1197	2.708	.0070*

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
     Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 25

Model Relating Importance of Benefits to Satisfaction with Organizational Climate

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	8.2039	2.029	.0499
Error	514	296.9550		
Total	521	305.1590		
R-Square	.0269			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for HO	p
Intercept	1	3.6563	20.839	.0001
IC2	1	0.0012	0.029	.9766
OS2	1	0.0696	1.663	.0969
PCL2	1	0.0394	0.991	.3219
PDO2	1	−0.0278	−0.793	.4280
EVAL2	1	−0.0266	−0.672	.5018
PROMO2	1	−0.0330	−0.854	.3937
RPC2	1	0.0830	2.013	.0446*

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
     Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

Table 26

Model Relating Importance of Professional Effectiveness to
Satisfaction with Organizational Climate

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Value	p Value
Model	7	6.8006	3.050	.0037
Error	518	164.9883		
Total	525	171.7889		
R-Square	.0396			

Variable	df	Parameter Estimate	t Value for HO	p
Intercept	1	4.1578	32.049	.0001
IC2	1	0.0294	0.910	.3634
OS2	1	−0.0155	−0.502	.6157
PCL2	1	0.0018	0.063	.9500
PDO2	1	−0.0151	−0.585	.5590
EVAL2	1	0.0013	0.045	.9644
PROMO2	1	−0.0279	−0.974	.3303
RPC2	1	0.1187	3.908	.0001*

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communication
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development
    Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation
PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns

relationships were noted between (a) APC and regard for personal concerns (RPC2), as indicated by the p value of 0.0191, and (b) APC and evaluation (EVAL2), as evidenced by the p value of 0.0374. These data suggested that chief instructional officers were satisfied with the degree of their autonomy, power, control if the college's evaluation process was fair and supportive and if the college demonstrated a regard for employees' personal concerns.

Relationships with Peers

Table 21 shows the analysis of the relationship between relationships with peers (RWP) and satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors IC2, OS2, PC2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2. The analysis revealed no significant relationships.

Relationships with Subordinates

Table 22 shows the analysis of the relationship between relationships with subordinates (RWSUB) and satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors IC2, OS2, PC2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2. In this analysis, a significant relationship was found between RWSub and IC2, as evidenced by the p value of 0.0345. These data indicated that a chief instructional officer's satisfaction with his or her relationships with subordinates was related to the college's level of internal communication.

Relationship with Supervisor

Table 23 shows the analysis of relationship between relationship with supervisor (RWSUP) and satisfaction with

the seven organizational climate factors IC2, OS2, PC2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2. In this analysis, significant relationships were found between RWSup and (a) IC2, and (b) OS2, as indicated by the p values of 0.0478 and 0.0001, respectively. These data indicated that internal communication as well as organizational structure were significantly related to how satisfied a chief instructional officer was in his or her relationship with the supervisor.

Salary

Table 24 shows the relationship between salary (SAL) and satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors IC2, OS2, PC2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2. In this analysis, significant relationships were found between SAL and (a) IC2 and (b) RPC2, as evidenced by the p values of 0.0128 and 0.0070, respectively. These data indicated that chief instructional officers were satisfied when internal communication was strong and when the college exhibited a regard for employees' personal concerns.

Benefits

Table 25 shows the relationship between benefits (BENE) and satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors IC2, OS2, PC2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2. In this analysis, a significant relationship was again found with RPC2. These data indicated that the chief instructional officer's satisfaction with benefits was related to how well the college demonstrated a regard for employees' personal concerns.

Professional Effectiveness

Table 26 shows the relationship between professional effectiveness (PE) and satisfaction with the seven organizational climate factors IC2, OS2, PC2, PDO2, EVAL2, PROMO2, and RPC2. In this analysis, a significant relationship was found between PE and RPC2, as evidenced by a p value of 0.0001. These data indicated that a chief instructional officer was satisfied with his or her professional effectiveness when the college demonstrated a regard for employees' personal concerns.

Summary

The regression analysis procedure identified several organizational climate factors that were significantly related to job satisfaction for community college chief instructional officers. Specifically, (a) internal communication (IC2), (b) regard for personal concerns (RPC2), or (c) both were shown to be related to job satisfaction as it pertains to:

1. Participation in decision-making (DM);

2. Autonomy, power, control (APC);

3. Relationships with subordinates (RWSub);

4. Salary (SAL);

5. Benefits (BENE); and

6. Professional effectiveness (PE).

Additionally, evaluation (EVAL2) was shown to be related to autonomy, power, control (APC), and organizational structure

(OS2) was shown to be related to relationship with supervisor (RWSup).

<div align="center">Research Question 5</div>

Research question 5 compared the means for job satisfaction within the context of organizational climate while controlling for the demographic variables of gender, ethnicity, years of experience as a college administrator, classification of the community college by size, and faculty collective bargaining status, to determine if significant differences existed. Only demographic variables that appeared in the majority of the survey responses were coded for analysis of research question 5. Those demographic variables were coded as follows:

GEND1 = Females

GEND2 = Males

ETH2 = Black

ETH3 = Hispanic

ETH4 = White

CCC2 = Suburban Community College

CCC3 = Urban/Inner City Community College

CCC4 = Metropolitan Community College

CCC5 = Community College adjacent to a Residential
     University

CCC6 = Any combination of other CCC classifications

CCC7 = Rural Community College

YRS1 = Served less than 1 year as a college administrator

YRS2 = Served 1 to 5 years

YRS3 = Served 6 to 10 years

YRS4 = Served 10 to 14 years

YRS5 = Served 15 years or more

CB1 = Faculty Collective Bargaining exists at the College

CB2 = Faculty Collective Bargaining does not exist at the
      College

In each instance, the analysis was run to compare a given
mean within each demographic variable against the one which
received the largest number of responses. For example, the
ethnic groups of Blacks and Hispanics were each compared to
Whites, and all community college classifications were
compared to CCC7, rural community colleges, because these
were the categories that received the most responses.

Decision-making

    Table 27 shows the data that compares scores for
decision-making (DM) within the context of organizational
climate while controlling for the demographic variables of
gender (GEND), ethnicity (ETH), classification of community
college by size (CCC), number of years served as a college
administrator (YRS) and faculty collective bargaining status
(CB1). Satisfaction with decision-making in the context of
organizational climate was found to vary significantly for
chief instructional officers who work in community colleges
that are a mixture of rural, suburban, urban, metropolitan,
and/or colleges adjacent to a residential university (code
CCC6, henceforth referred to as mix colleges) as compared
with chief instructional officers working in rural community

Table 27

Model Relating Decision-Making Within the Context of
Organizational Climate While Controlling for Five
Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p Value
GEND	1	0.203	0.75	.387
ETH	2	0.619	1.14	.321
CCC	5	1.941	1.43	.213
YRS	4	0.878	0.81	.521
CB1	1	0.073	0.27	.603

Parameter	Estimate	t for H0	p
Intercept	4.071	27.14	.0001
GEND1	0.049	0.86	.3876
GEND2	0.000	.	.
ETH2	−0.214	−1.51	.1329
ETH3	−0.025	−0.18	.8606
ETH4	0.000	.	.
CCC2	0.0107	1.64	.1010
CCC3	0.094	0.81	.4186
CCC4	0.161	1.89	.0596
CCC5	0.0375	0.24	.8116
CCC6	0.1878	2.07	.0393*
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	−0.0656	−0.43	.6684
YRS2	−0.0863	−0.97	.3349
YRS3	0.0733	1.07	.2842
YRS4	−0.0116	−0.17	.8668
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	0.0272	0.52	.6032
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

```
GEND1 = Female              YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male                YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black                YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic             YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White                YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no
```

colleges (CCC7). This was evidenced by the p value of 0.0393, and the fact that the adjusted mean for the respondents in mix colleges is 0.187 higher than that for respondents in rural colleges. In other words, the mean score for satisfaction with decision-making was 0.187 greater for chief instructional officers working in mix colleges than for those working in rural colleges. This is significant at the alpha < = 0.05 level.

Autonomy, Power, Control

Table 28 shows the data that compares autonomy, power, control (APC) within the context of organizational climate while controlling for the same demographic variables. Satisfaction with autonomy, power, control within the context of organizational climate was found to vary significantly for chief instructional officers who work in community colleges that are adjacent to residential universities (CCC5) as compared to those who work in rural community colleges (CCC7). This was evidenced by a p value of 0.0015, and the fact that the mean for respondents in CCC5 is .7438 lower than that for respondents in CCC7. In other words, the mean score for satisfaction with autonomy, power, control was .7438 lower for chief instructional officers working in community colleges adjacent to a residential university.

Relationships with Peers

Table 29 shows the data that compares scores for relationships with peers (RWP) within the context of

Table 28

Model Relating Autonomy, Power, Control Within the Context of Organizational Climate While Controlling for Five Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p Value
GEND	1	0.008	0.01	.903
ETH	2	1.544	1.29	.276
CCC	5	7.698	2.57	.026
YRS	4	0.677	0.28	.889
CB1	1	0.230	0.39	.534

Parameter	Estimate	t for HO	p
Intercept	3.544	15.96	.0001
GEND1	−0.0103	−0.12	.9031
GEND2	0.0000	.	.
ETH2	0.3234	1.49	.1368
ETH3	0.1461	0.68	.4987
ETH4	0.0000	.	.
CCC2	0.0168	0.64	.5240
CCC3	−0.0186	−0.11	.9147
CCC4	−0.1523	−1.20	.2297
CCC5	−0.7438	−3.19	.0015*
CCC6	−0.0224	−0.17	.8685
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	0.0319	0.14	.8884
YRS2	−0.1327	−1.00	.3171
YRS3	−0.0095	−0.09	.9249
YRS4	−0.0338	−0.33	.7432
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	−0.0482	−0.62	.5349
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

GEND1 = Female   YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male   YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black   YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic   YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White   YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no

Table 29

Model Relating Relationships with Peers Within the Context
of Organizational Climate While Controlling for Five
Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p Value
GEND	1	2.608	5.62	.018
ETH	2	1.107	1.19	.304
CCC	5	2.002	0.86	.506
YRS	4	0.540	0.29	.883
CB1	1	0.288	0.62	.431

Parameter	Estimate	t for HO	p
Intercept	3.9421	20.11	.0001
GEND1	0.1761	2.37	.0182*
GEND2	0.0000	.	.
ETH2	0.0571	0.31	.7586
ETH3	0.2903	1.53	.1273
ETH4	0.0000	.	.
CCC2	0.1657	1.94	.0528
CCC3	0.0169	0.11	.9117
CCC4	0.0557	0.50	.6172
CCC5	0.1897	0.92	.3562
CCC6	0.8029	0.68	.4991
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	-0.0686	-0.33	.7419
YRS2	-0.0212	-0.18	.8555
YRS3	-0.0845	-0.95	.3436
YRS4	-0.0681	-0.75	.4527
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	-0.0586	-0.79	.4313
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

```
GEND1 = Female                  YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male                    YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black                    YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic                 YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White                    YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no
```

organizational climate while controlling for the same demographic variables. Satisfaction with relationships with peers in the context of organizational climate was found to vary significantly for female chief instructional officers (GEND1) as compared with males (GEND2). This was evidenced by the p value of 0.0182, and the fact that the adjusted mean for females is 0.176 higher than that for males. In other words, the mean score for satisfaction with relationships with peers was 0.176 greater for females than for males.

Relationships with Subordinates

Table 30 shows the data that compares scores for relationships with subordinates (RWSub) within the context of organizational climate while controlling for the same demographic variables. There were no significant relationships found in this analysis.

Relationship with Supervisor

Table 31 shows the data that compares relationship with supervisor (RWSup) within the context of organizational climate while controlling for the same demographic variables. Satisfaction with relationship with supervisor within the context of organizational climate was found to vary significantly for chief instructional officers who have held administrative positions for less than one year (YRS1) as compared to those who have held administrative positions for 15 years or more (YRS5). This was evidenced by a p value of 0.0492, and the fact that the mean for respondents

Table 30

Model Relating Relationships with Subordinates Within the
Context of Organizational Climate While Controlling for Five
Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p value
GEND	1	0.000	0.00	.981
ETH	2	1.372	1.84	.160
CCC	5	1.425	0.77	.575
YRS	4	0.177	0.12	.975
CB1	1	0.158	0.43	.514

Parameter	Estimate	t for HO	p
Intercept	3.9772	22.71	.0001
GEND1	0.0015	0.02	.9813
GEND2	0.0000	.	.
ETH2	-0.0725	-0.44	.6629
ETH3	0.3138	1.84	.0660
ETH4	0.0000	.	.
CCC2	0.0901	1.18	.2390
CCC3	-0.0903	-0.66	.5102
CCC4	0.0382	0.38	.7018
CCC5	0.2529	1.37	.1701
CCC6	0.0489	0.46	.6493
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	0.0269	0.15	.8804
YRS2	-0.0156	-0.15	.8809
YRS3	-0.0508	-0.64	.5255
YRS4	-0.0108	-0.13	.8942
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	0.0400	0.65	.5143
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

```
GEND1 = Female                YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male                  YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black                  YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic               YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White                  YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no
```

Table 31

Model Relating Relationship with Supervisor Within the
Context of Organizational Climate While Controlling for Five
Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p Value
GEND	1	0.0695	0.23	.634
ETH	2	0.3137	0.51	.600
CCC	5	1.9279	1.25	.282
YRS	4	2.5400	2.07	.084
CB1	1	0.1645	0.54	.464

Parameter	Estimate	t for HO	P
Intercept	3.8638	24.29	.0001
GEND1	0.0287	0.48	.6346
GEND2	0.0000	.	.
ETH2	0.0383	0.25	.7998
ETH3	0.1530	0.99	.3228
ETH4	0.0000	.	.
CCC2	0.1134	1.63	.1028
CCC3	0.0146	0.12	.9062
CCC4	0.1183	1.30	.1927
CCC5	0.2586	1.55	.1226
CCC6	0.1570	1.61	.1085
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	-0.3209	-1.97	.0492*
YRS2	-0.1102	-1.16	.2460
YRS3	0.0323	0.45	.6558
YRS4	0.0916	1.24	.2151
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	0.0408	0.73	.4647
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

GEND1 = Female   YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male   YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black   YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic   YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White   YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no

in YRS1 is 0.3209 lower than that for respondents in YRS5.
In other words, the mean score for satisfaction with
relationship with supervisor was 0.3209 lower for chief
instructional officers who have worked in an administrative
position for less than one year.

Salary

Table 32 shows the data that compares scores for salary
(SAL) within the context of organizational climate while
controlling for the same demographic variables.
Satisfaction with salary in the context of organizational
climate was found to vary significantly for five specific
groups. First, satisfaction with salary for Black chief
instructional officers (ETH2) varied significantly as
compared with Whites (ETH4). This was evidenced by the p
value of 0.0062, and the fact that the adjusted mean for
Blacks was 0.6101 higher than that for Whites. In other
words, the mean score for satisfaction with salary was
0.6101 greater for Blacks than for Whites. Secondly,
satisfaction with salary for chief instructional officers
working in mix community colleges (CCC6) varied
significantly from satisfaction for those working in rural
community colleges. This was evidenced by the p value of
.0367 and the fact that the adjusted mean for chief
instructional officers from mix colleges was 0.297 greater
than for those from rural colleges. In other words, the
mean score for satisfaction with salary was 0.297 greater
for respondents from mix colleges. Third, satisfaction with

Table 32

Model Relating Salary Within the Context of Organizational Climate While Controlling for Five Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p Value
GEND	1	1.3155	1.98	.1596
ETH	2	5.0362	3.80	.0232
CCC	5	3.2541	0.98	.4284
YRS	4	5.1748	1.95	.1010
CB1	1	5.5816	8.42	.0039

Parameter	Estimate	t for H0	p
Intercept	3.4364	14.71	.0001
GEND1	0.1249	1.41	.1596
GEND2	0.0000	.	.
ETH2	0.6101	2.75	.0062*
ETH3	−0.0110	−0.05	.9611
ETH4	0.0000	.	.
CCC2	0.11046	1.03	.3049
CCC3	0.059	0.58	.5624
CCC4	0.1370	1.03	.3041
CCC5	0.0208	0.08	.9324
CCC6	0.2971	2.10	.0367*
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	−0.4830	−2.02	.0438*
YRS2	−0.1284	−0.92	.3572
YRS3	−0.2349	−2.21	.0280*
YRS4	−0.0608	−0.56	.5746
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	−2.2369	−2.90	.0039*
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

```
GEND1 = Female                YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male                  YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black                  YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic               YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White                  YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no
```

salary for chief instructional officers who had served as administrators for either less than one year or for 10 to 14 years varied significantly from those who had served in administrative positions for over 15 years, as evidenced by p values of 0.0438 and 0.0280, respectively. These relationships, however, were negative, meaning that chief instructional officers who were in either the YRS1 or YRS4 categories were less satisfied than were those in YRS5. The adjusted mean score for YRS1 was -0.4830 and for YRS4 was -0.2349. In other words, the mean score for chief instructional officers who have held administrative positions for less than one year is 0.4830 lower than the mean score for chief instructional officers who have held administrative positions for 15 years or more, and the mean score for chief instructional officers who have held administrative positions for 10-14 years is 0.2349 lower than the mean score for those who have held administrative positions for 15 years or more; both of these variances are significant due to the p values previously stated. Finally, satisfaction with salary within the context of organizational climate was found to vary significantly for chief instructional officers who worked in colleges whose faculty were unionized (CB1.1) as compared with those who worked in colleges without faculty unions (CB1.2). As noted on the table, the p value for CB1.1 is 0.0039 and the estimate for CB1.1 is -2.2369. In other words, the adjusted mean score for chief instructional officers in unionized

colleges was 2.2369 lower than the mean score for chief instructional officers from non-unionized colleges, and this is significant due to the stated p value.

Benefits

Table 33 shows the data that compares scores for benefits (BENE) within the context of organizational climate while controlling for the same demographic variables. Satisfaction with salary in the context of organizational climate was found to vary significantly for the same five groups for which the measures of satisfaction varied in salary. First, satisfaction with salary for Black chief instructional officers (ETH2) varied significantly as compared with Whites (ETH4). This was evidenced by the p value of 0.0006, and the fact that the adjusted mean for Blacks was 0.2197 higher than that for Whites. In other words, the mean score for satisfaction with salary was 0.2197 greater for Blacks than for Whites. Secondly, satisfaction with salary for chief instructional officers working in mix community colleges (CCC6) varied significantly from satisfaction for those working in rural community colleges. This was evidenced by the p value of 0.0058 and the fact that the adjusted mean for chief instructional officers from mix colleges was 0.4927 greater than for those from rural colleges. In other words, the mean score for satisfaction with salary was 0.4927 greater for respondents from mix colleges. Third, satisfaction with salary for chief instructional officers who have served as

Table 33

Model Relating Benefits Within the Context of Organizational
Climate While Controlling for Five Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p Value
GEND	1	0.0642	0.12	.7328
ETH	2	6.9817	6.34	.0019
CCC	5	8.5710	3.11	.0090
YRS	4	6.8077	3.09	.0158
CB1	1	6.9753	12.67	.0004

Parameter	Estimate	t for H0	p
Intercept	3.8141	17.84	.0001
GEND1	0.0277	0.34	.7328
GEND2	0.0000	.	.
ETH2	0.7003	3.46	.0006*
ETH3	0.2197	1.02	.3064
ETH4	0.0000	.	.
CCC2	0.0940	1.01	.3143
CCC3	-0.2872	-1.72	.0857
CCC4	0.1287	1.06	.2903
CCC5	0.0385	1.72	.0857
CCC6	0.3626	2.77	.0058*
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	-0.4927	-2.26	.0243*
YRS2	0.0436	0.34	.7323
YRS3	-0.2426	-2.47	.0138*
YRS4	0.0267	0.27	.7865
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	-0.2661	-3.56	.0004*
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

```
GEND1 = Female                 YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male                   YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black                   YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic                YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White                   YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no
```

administrators for either less than one year or for 10 to 14
years varied significantly from those who had served in
administrative positions for over 15 years, as evidenced by
p values of 0.0243 and 0.0138, respectively. These
relationships, however, were negative, meaning that chief
instructional officers who were in either the YRS1 or YRS4
categories were less satisfied than were those in YRS5. The
adjusted mean score for YRS1 was -0.4927 and for YRS4 was -
0.2426. In other words, the score for chief instructional
officers who have held administrative positions for less
than one year is 0.4927 lower than the score for chief
instructional officers who have held administrative
positions for 15 years or more, and the mean score for chief
instructional officers who have held administrative
positions for 10-14 years is 0.2426 lower than the mean
score for those who have held administrative positions for
15 years or more; these variances are significant due to the
p values previously stated. Finally, satisfaction with
salary within the context of organizational climate was
found to vary significantly for chief instructional officers
who worked in colleges whose faculty were unionized (CB1.1)
as compared with those who worked in colleges without
faculty unions (CB1.2). As noted on the table, the p value
for CB1.1 is 0.0004 and the estimate for CB1.1 is -0.2661.
In other words, the mean score for chief instructional
officers in unionized colleges is 0.2661 lower than the mean

score for chief instructional officers from non-unionized colleges, and this is significant due to the stated p value.

Professional Effectiveness

Table 34 shows the data that compares professional effectiveness (PE) within the context of organizational climate while controlling for the same demographic variables. Satisfaction with professional effectiveness within the context of organizational climate was found to vary significantly for two groups. First, satisfaction with professional effectiveness varies significantly for female chief instructional officers as compared to males. This was evidenced by the p value of 0.0074, and the fact that the adjusted mean for females is 0.1626 higher than for males. In other words, the score for females is 0.1626 greater, meaning that females' satisfaction with professional effectiveness is greater than is the satisfaction for males. Secondly, satisfaction with professional effectiveness varies for chief instructional officers who work in suburban community colleges (CCC2) as compared to those who work in rural community colleges (CCC7). This was evidenced by a p value of 0.0360, and the fact that the mean for respondents in CCC2 is 0.1458 higher than that for respondents in CCC7. In other words, the mean score for satisfaction with professional effectiveness is .1458 higher for chief instructional officers working in suburban community colleges.

Table 34

Model Relating Professional Effectiveness Within the Context
of Organizational Climate While Controlling for Five
Demographic Variables

Source	df	Type III SS	F Value	p Value
GEND	1	2.2210	7.23	.0074
ETH	2	0.9933	1.62	.1996
CCC	5	2.0323	1.32	.2528
YRS	4	0.1264	0.10	.9813
CB1	1	0.5308	1.73	.1892

Parameter	Estimate	t for H0	p
Intercept	4.2041	26.42	.0001
GEND1	0.1626	2.69	.0074*
GEND2	0.0000	.	.
ETH2	−0.2344	−1.55	.1214
ETH3	0.1277	0.83	.4090
ETH4	0.0000	.	.
CCC2	0.1458	2.10	.0360*
CCC3	0.0943	0.76	.4487
CCC4	0.1562	1.72	.0854
CCC5	0.068	0.41	.6808
CCC6	−0.0036	−0.04	.9704
CCC7	0.0000	.	.
YRS1	−0.0222	−0.14	.8913
YRS2	−0.0267	−0.28	.7783
YRS3	−0.0457	−0.63	.5307
YRS4	−0.0114	−016	.8762
YRS5	0.0000	.	.
CB1.1	−0.0731	−1.31	.1892
CB1.2	0.0000	.	.

* = significant relationship at p value of <= 0.05

GEND1 = Female   YRS1 = Less than 1 year
GEND2 = Male   YRS2 = 1-5 years
ETH2 = Black   YRS3 = 6-10 years
ETH3 = Hispanic   YRS4 = 10-14 years
ETH4 = White   YRS5 = 15 years or more
CCC2 = Suburban
CCC3 = Urban/Inner City
CCC4 = Metropolitan
CCC5 = Community College adjacent to Residential University
CCC6 = Any mix of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, CCC7
CCC7 = Rural
CB1.1 = Faculty collective bargaining--yes
CB1.2 = Faculty collective bargaining--no

Summary

One-thousand-sixty surveys were mailed to chief
instructional officers at community colleges that were 1994
members of the American Association of Community Colleges
(AACC). A total of 539 surveys were collected, coded and
recorded in this analysis, representing a 51% rate of
return. The data provided a profile of the community
college chief instructional officer and composites of
community college chief instructional officers' perceptions
of organizational climate, their satisfaction with
organizational climate, and how important they found eight
job satisfaction variables to be in the performance of their
jobs. In addition, the regression analysis was used to
determine if significant relationships existed between each
job satisfaction variable and community college chief
instructional officers' satisfaction with organizational
climate. Further, regression analysis was used to determine
if significant differences in means for job satisfaction
existed when controls were entered for gender, ethnicity,
classification of the community college by size, number of
years served as a college administrator, and faculty
collective bargaining status. Summaries of the
organizational climate factors that were significantly
related to job satisfaction variables (research question 4)
and which means varied significantly when controlling for
the five demographic variables (research question 5) are

shown in Tables 35 and 36, respectively. Chapter 5 includes
an analysis of this data and conclusions that can be drawn
from this research.

Table 35
Summary of Significant Relationships Found Between
Organizational Climate Factors and Job Satisfaction
Variables

Job Satisfaction Variable	Organizational Climate Predictor	p Value
Participation in Decision Decision Making	Internal Communication	0.0236
Autonomy, Power, Control	Evaluation Regard for Personal Concern	0.0374 0.0191
Relationships with Peers	none	none
Relationships with Subordinates	Internal Communication	0.0345
Relationship with Supervisor	Organizational Structure	0.0001
Salary	Internal Communication Regard for Personal Concerns	0.0128 0.0070
Benefits	Regard for Personal Concerns	0.0446
Professional Effectiveness	Regard for Personal Concerns	0.0001

Table 36

Summary of the Significant Differences in Means for the
Measures of Job Satisfaction When Compared by the Five
Demographic Variables

Job Satisfaction Variables	Demographic Variables	p Value
Participation in Decision Making	CCC6	0.0393
Autonomy, Power, Control	CCC5	0.0015
Relationships with Peers	GEND1	0.0182
Relationships with Subordinates	none	none
Relationship with Supervisor	YRS1	0.0492
Salary	ETH2	0.0062
	CCC6	0.0367
	YRS1	0.0438
	YRS3	0.0280
	CB1	0.0004
Benefits	ETH2	0.0006
	CCC6	0.0058
	YRS1	0.0243
	YRS3	0.0138
	CB1	0.0004
Professional Effectiveness	GEND1	0.0074
	CCC2	0.0360

GEND1 = Females
ETH2 = Black
YRS1 = less than 1 year
YRS3 = 6-10 Years
CCC2 = Suburban Community College
CCC5 = Community college adjacent to a Residential
       University
CCC6 = any combination of CCC2, CCC3, CCC4, CCC5, and CCC7
CB1 = faculty collective bargaining exists at the college

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction as applied to chief instructional officers in community colleges. A secondary purpose was to determine if there were significant differences in means for job satisfaction within the context of organizational climate when controlling for gender, ethnicity, classification of the community college by size, number of years experience as a college administrator, and collective bargaining status of the community college. Specifically, the research addressed five questions:

1. How do community college chief instructional officers perceive organizational climate in their respective institutions, using a set of seven identified factors for climate?

2. Using the same seven climate factors as an index, how satisfied are community college chief instructional officers with the organizational climate at their respective institutions?

3. How important are each of eight identified job satisfaction variables to community college chief

instructional officers in the performance of their specific
job responsibilities?

4. For each of eight job satisfaction variables, is
there a significant relationship between measures of job
satisfaction and measures of satisfaction with
organizational climate, as reported by community college
chief instructional officers?

5. Is there a significant difference in the means of
eight job satisfaction variables for community college chief
instructional officers when compared by gender of the
respondent, ethnic origin of the respondent, classification
of the community college by size, length of time served as a
college administrator, and collective bargaining status of
the community college?

<div align="center">Conclusions</div>

Profile of the Community College Chief Instructional
  Officer

The community college chief instructional officer is
likely to be a White male who has been a college
administrator for 15 years or more. He or she is also
likely to work at a rural community college, in accordance
with Katsinas' proposed classification system. Almost half
of the community college chief instructional officers who
participated in this research work in colleges with faculty
collective bargaining.

Perceptions of and Satisfaction with Organizational
  Climate

In assessing perceptions of organizational climate, it
was found that community college chief instructional
officers generally perceive their colleges to have a high
regard for their personal concerns, ample opportunities for
professional development, and a strong system of internal
communication, as indicated by the high ratings for regard
for personal concerns (RPC), professional development
opportunities (PDO), and internal communication (IC).
Accordingly, community college chief instructional officers
are generally most satisfied with these same three aspects
of organizational climate, as indicated by the high ratings
for satisfaction with regard for personal concerns (RPC2),
professional development opportunities (PDO2), and internal
communication (IC2). Although the satisfaction scores for
RPC and PDO were almost identical to the perception scores,
the rating for satisfaction with internal communication was
slightly lower than the corresponding perception score. It
is possible to infer that although community college chief
instructional officers perceive strong internal
communication in general, they also feel that there is room
for improvement with this aspect of organizational climate.
These findings supported conclusions found in the
literature, specifically by Deas (1994), Ginsberg (1994a),
Kelly (1988), Thor (1993 & 1994), and Vroom (1982), that
significant relationships existed between job satisfaction

and (a) regard for personal concerns, (b) professional
development opportunities, and (c) internal communication.

Importance of Job Satisfaction

The research also revealed that community college chief
instructional officers believe all eight identified job
satisfaction variables to be important in their jobs,
however, salary (SAL), benefits (BENE), and autonomy, power,
control (APC) are less important to community college chief
instructional officers than participation in decision-making
(DM), relationships with colleagues (RWP, RWSub, RWSup), and
professional effectiveness (PE). These findings are
consistent with the previous research conducted by Groseth
(1978) and Levy (1989), which also indicated that salary and
benefits were less important to managers and administrators
in educational settings. Additionally, these findings
validate and support Herzberg's two-factor theory of job
satisfaction.

Although Glasser placed control at the center of his
theory of quality work, the results of this research
indicated that autonomy, power, control (APC) was less
important than most other identified job satisfaction
variables. Nevertheless, the mean score for APC was still
sufficiently high to support Glasser's theory. It is
possible that the lower mean score recorded for APC was
related to community college chief instructional officers'
strong perceptions of and high satisfaction with regard for
personal concerns (RPC) and internal communications (IC) at

their colleges. In other words, as long as the chief instructional officer works in an environment where his or her own interests are considered important, and where there is a strong system of internal communication, he or she is likely to be less concerned with issues regarding autonomy, power, and control.

The Relationship between Measures of Organizational Climate and Measures of Job Satisfaction

In evaluating the relationships between measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction for community college chief instructional officers, internal communication (IC) was found to be significantly related to participation in decision-making (DM), relationships with subordinates (RWSub), and salary (SAL). Regard for personal concerns (RPC) was found to be significantly related to autonomy, power, control (APC), salary (SAL), benefits (BENE), and professional effectiveness (PE). These findings reinforced the research that began with Mayo (1933) and has continued through Deal and Jenkins (1994), which stresses the importance of human relations perspectives in leadership. The greater the college's demonstration of regard for personal concerns, the more satisfied the chief instructional officer will be with autonomy, power, control; salary, benefits, and professional effectiveness. Likewise, the more a college exhibits a commitment to strong internal communication, the more likely the chief instructional officer is to be satisfied with participation in decision-making, relationships with subordinates, and salary. This

finding is similar to Milosheff's (1992) conclusion that
contented coworkers contribute to a healthy work
environment, however, this research did not attempt to
identify a causal relationship between satisfaction and
climate.

In addition to these significant relationships,
evaluation (EVAL) was found to be significantly related to
autonomy, power, control (APC). Further research is needed
to understand why this relationship is significant.
Finally, organizational structure (OS) was found to be
significantly related to relationship with supervisor
(RWSup). This finding suggests that if the chief
instructional officer is satisfied with the organizational
structure of his or her college, then a positive
relationship between the chief instructional officer and his
or her supervisor is likely to exist. It is important to
note, however, that this finding is not an endorsement of
any specific type of organizational structure. Unlike
Twombley and Amey (1994), who denounced rigid structure and
hierarchy as a model that works well in military settings
but has no place in the education arena, this finding
supports the research by Blix et al. (1994), Bretz and Judge
(1994), Caplan (1993), and Chatman (1991) that emphasized
the importance of a good fit between the person and the
organization. It is likely that regardless of whether a
college is characterized by a high level of hierarchy or a
more flat organizational structure, chief instructional

officers will be satisfied with their relationships with
their supervisors if they are also satisfied with the
organizational structure of the college.

<u>Significant Differences in Measures of Job Satisfaction When</u>
  <u>Controlling for Demographic Variables</u>

When comparing the mean job satisfaction ratings within
the context of organizational climate while controlling for
demographic variables, it was found that chief instructional
officers who worked at community colleges that were a
combination of any of five geographic classifications
(rural, suburban, metropolitan, urban, and community college
adjacent to a residential university), or mix colleges, were
more satisfied with their participation in decision-making
than were their counterparts at rural community colleges.
Chief instructional officers who worked at community
colleges adjacent to residential universities were found to
be slightly less satisfied with autonomy, power, control
than were their counterparts at rural community colleges.
Females were more satisfied in their relationships with
peers than were male chief instructional officers. Chief
instructional officers who had been college administrators
for less than one year were less satisfied than those who
had been administrators for 15 years or more.

Five distinctions among demographic variables were found
in satisfaction with salary, and the same distinctions were
found in satisfaction with benefits. Black chief
instructional officers tended to be more satisfied with
salary and benefits than were Whites. Chief instructional

officers from mix community colleges tended to be more
satisfied with salary and benefits than were their
counterparts from rural community colleges. Chief
instructional officers who had been administrators for less
than one year, or for 6 to 10 years tended to be less
satisfied with salary and benefits than were chief
instructional officers who had been college administrators
for 15 years or more. Finally, chief instructional officers
from colleges with faculty collective bargaining tended to
be less satisfied with salary and benefits than were their
counterparts from colleges without faculty collective
bargaining.

   Satisfaction with professional effectiveness varied by
gender and by classification of community college. Female
chief instructional officers tended to be more satisfied
with their professional effectiveness than were males, and
chief instructional officers from suburban community
colleges tended to be more satisfied with professional
effectiveness than were their counterparts from rural
community colleges.

<u>Implications</u>

   The conclusions reached in this research have broad
implications that should be considered as all organizations
work to enhance climate and foster job satisfaction among
employees. In addition, other implications also exist
specifically for leaders in community colleges.

In the broader context, three implications can be derived from this study. First, those who are interested in creating a positive organizational climate and building satisfaction among employees should recognize that it is most important to consider employees' perceptions of and satisfaction with the organization's (a) demonstration of a regard for employees' personal concerns, (b) opportunities for professional development, (c) internal communication system, and (d) evaluation system. Second, perceptions of and satisfaction with the organization's political climate has potential for affecting job satisfaction in employees. Finally, given the organizational structure (and implicitly, the leadership style of the chief executive officer), employees who "fit" within the structure of their organization are more likely to be satisfied with their position than are those who do not "fit" into their organizations.

In applying these findings to community colleges, specific implications exist for the future of leadership for this segment of higher education. As a group, community college chief instructional officers lack diversity. Although women have made gradual inroads into upper level administration in community colleges via this rank, very few ethnic minorities hold the chief instructional officer title in community colleges. Historically, community college presidents have been selected from the pool of chief instructional officers, a trend that is not expected to

change. This research reinforces predictions of Vaughan
(1990) and Perkins (1991) that the next generation of
community college presidents is likely to be a homogeneous
as the present generation, given the homogeneity of the body
of chief instructional officers. College presidents and
trustees should be aware of the lack of diversity among
chief instructional officers. This condition threatens to
limit the possibilities of advancements for women and
minorities who may aspire to be future community college
presidents, since presidents are most often selected from
among the ranks of chief instructional officer. Every
effort should be made to support talented and capable women
and minorities in academe, and to encourage them to pursue a
career path that might lead them to an opportunity to become
a chief instructional officer. Executive leadership is
essential in order to make this happen.

Gender, ethnicity, classification of community college
by size, number of years served as a college administrator,
and collective bargaining status can all be related to job
satisfaction. The number of incidences in which the
classification of community college was shown to be related
to job satisfaction within the context of organizational
climate effectively documents the need for a clear and well
defined system for classifying community colleges. The
quality of the research on community colleges will be
enhanced by such a system. The work that has been done by
Katsinas (unpublished) is a fine start. More needs to be

done to diminish the overlap that currently exists among the classifications, to prevent colleges from identifying with more than one category.

Suggestions for Further Research

Several specific opportunities exist to further advance the body of knowledge as it pertains to organizational climate and job satisfaction. First, it would be helpful to know if similar relationships between measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction exist in other community college cabinet level positions. For example, do community college chief business officers perceive organizational climate similarly to chief instructional officers, and are they equally satisfied with climate at their respective institutions?

Second, given the high importance ratings for all job satisfaction variables identified in this study, it would be helpful to know how community college administrators ranked these variables. In other words, would salary and benefits be conclusively ranked as least important, as suggested by Herzberg, Groseth, and Levy?

Third, a closer examination of the relationship between evaluation and autonomy, power, control should be undertaken to determine why this relationship exists and what can be done to make best use of this relationship.

Fourth, a definitive, demographic study into the profile of the community college chief instructional officer would be helpful to verify or clarify the findings of this study.

Due to the lack of diversity among community college chief
instructional officers that is indicated from this research,
more qualitative methods might be helpful to obtain more
precise information on women and minorities, as well as on
differences that exist among all demographic variables.
Finally, as stated earlier, continued refinement of a
classification system for community colleges will enhance
all future research related to this segment of higher
education.

APPENDIX A
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF INSTRUCTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PANEL OF EXPERTS

1. Patricia Dyer, Chair
   Vice President of Academic Affairs
   Palm Beach Community College
   Lake Worth, FL

2. Carlton Williams
   Vice President of Instructional Affairs
   Colorado Northwestern Community College
   Rangely, CO

3. Linda Timmerman
   Dean of Academic Affairs
   Navarro College
   Corsicana, TX

4. Harry J. West
   Dean of Instruction
   Delaware Technical & Community College
   Stanton Campus
   Newark, DE

5. Gretchen J. Naff
   Vice President for Educational Affairs
   College of Lake county
   Grayslake, IL 60030

6. John T. Neibling
   Dean of Instruction
   San Juan College
   Farmington, NM

7. Janet Portolan
   Dean of Humanities
   Fullerton College
   Fullerton, CA

8. Monique Amerman
   President
   Mountain View College
   Dallas, TX

9. Carol J. Viola
   Provost
   College of DuPage
   Glen Ellyn, IL

10. Gerald Bazer
    Dean of Arts and Sciences
    Owens Community College
    Toledo, OH

11. Sharon Bradwish-Miller, Dean
    Instructional Affairs & Community Education
    College of DuPage
    Glen Ellyn, IL

12. Donald Goss
    Director of Academic Programs
    Tennessee Higher Education Commission
    Nashville, TN

13. Marjory A. Stewart
    Provost
    Massachusetts Bay Community College
    Wellesley Hills, MA

14. Gwendolyn Herndon
    Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs
    Shelby State Community College
    Memphis, TN

15. Frank Wright, Jr.
    Dean of Instruction
    Hutchinson Community College
    Hutchinson, KS

16. Viola Lopez, Dean
    Mathematics and Advanced Technology
    Portland Community College
    Portland, OR

17. Ed Meadows
    Vice President
    Bevill State Community College
    Sumiton, AL

18. J. Leon Jones
    Vice President for Academic & Student Affairs
    Pellissippi State Technical Community College
    Knoxville, TN

19. Robert R. Evans
    Vice President for Educational Services
    Colorado Mountain College
    Glenwood Springs, CO

APPENDIX B
SUMMARY OF FIELD TEST DATA

| | Individuals Surveyed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Interval Difference | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | | | |
Question	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	0	1	2
PC2	1	1	5	5	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	4	5	2	1
PDO2	2	2	5	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	3	5	0
EVAL2	1	1	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	5	3	0
PROMO2	1	1	5	5	4	4	3	4	2	3	2	2	5	4	4	4	6	2	0
RPC2	1	1	3	3	5	5	2	4	4	3	5	4	3	3	5	5	5	2	1
DM	5	4	4	4	5	5	3	3	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	0
APC	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	2	4	4	5	4	5	2	1
RWP	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	2	4	4	5	4	5	2	1

Column A = 1st test survey
Column B = 2nd test survey
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional
    Development Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation

PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for
    Personal Concern
DM = Decision Making
APC = Autonomy, Power, Control
RWP = Relationship with Peers
Interval Difference = difference of responses between 1st and 2nd test survey

160

Appendix B--continued.

Question	Individuals Surveyed																Interval Difference		
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8				
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	0	1	2
RWSub	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	5	4	5	4	5	3	0
RWSup	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	3	0
SAL	4	4	2	2	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	7	0	1
BENE	4	5	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	0
PE	5	5	3	3	5	5	3	3	5	5	4	3	5	4	5	4	5	3	0
OSWP	2	2	2	2	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	6	1	1
OSWC	2	1	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	6	2	0

Column A = 1st Test Survey
Column B = 2nd Test Survey
RWSub = Relationship with Subordinates
RWSup = Relationship with Supervisor
SAL = Salary
BENE = Benefits
PE = Professional Effectiveness
OSWC = Overall Satisfaction with College
OSWP = Overall Satisfaction with Position
Int and Interval = Interval difference of responses between the 1st and 2nd test survey

Appendix B--continued.

	Individuals Surveyed																Interval Difference		
Question	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8				
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	0	1	2
Int: 0	15		24		20		17		12		7		16		8			Total 114	
Int: 1	8		0		4		6		10		16		8		11			63	
Int: 2	1		0		0		1		2		1		0		5			10	

Column A = 1st Test Survey
Column B = 2nd Test Survey
Int and Interval = Interval difference of responses between the 1st and 2nd test survey

Question	Correlation Coefficient	Question	Correlation Coefficient
IC	0.8546	PROMO2	0.9029
OS	0.2336	RPC2	0.7939
PC	0.9492	DM	0.7467
PDO	0.8013	APC	0.0000
EVAL	0.8438	RWP	0.5774
PROMO	0.7784	RWSub	0.8296
RPC	0.6885	RWSup	0.2582
IC2	0.8481	SAL	0.6963
OS2	0.6286	BENE	0.4170
PC2	0.8082	PE	0.8422
PDO2	0.7115	OSWP	0.7804
EVAL2	0.8274	OSWC	0.9254

IC = Internal Communications
OS = Organizational Structure
PCL = Political Climate
PDO = Professional Development Opportunities
EVAL = Evaluation
PROMO = Promotion
RPC = Regard for Personal Concerns
IC2 = Satisfaction with Internal Communications
OS2 = Satisfaction with Organizational Structure
PCL2 = Satisfaction with Political Climate
PDO2 = Satisfaction with Professional Development Opportunities
EVAL2 = Satisfaction with Evaluation

PROMO2 = Satisfaction with Promotion
RPC2 = Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concerns
DM = Decision Making
APC = Autonomy, Power, Control
RWP = Relationship with Peers
RWSub = Relationship with Subordinates
RWSup = Relationship with Supervisor
SAL = Salary
BENE = Benefits
PE = Professional Effectiveness
OSWP = Overall Satisfaction with Position
OSWC = Overall Satisfaction with College

APPENDIX D
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHIEF INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICERS

<u>Purpose and Rationale</u>: The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather perceptions about community college climate from chief instructional officers across the United States. Climate is defined as the conditions that affect job satisfaction and productivity. "Climate" to an organization is what "personality" is to an individual.

<u>Design of the Survey</u>: This survey consists of two parts.

Part I includes a set of questions related to the your specific community college and your position. Part I, Section A asks for your perceptions of general college characteristics. Section B asks for responses concerning how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the same characteristics. Section C is an inquiry into your specific job as Chief Instructional Officer. Sections D and E ask for your overall ratings of your position and of your college.

Part II includes questions pertaining to demographic information.

Please read all questions carefully. <u>All responses will be treated confidentially.</u>

Please return your completed survey by Friday, March 24, 1995 to:

Department of Educational Leadership
University of Florida
P.O. Box 117049
2403 Norman Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611-7049

A self-addressed envelope is provided for your convenience. Thank you for your time and thoughtful participation in this project.

Part I: <u>Organization and Position Ratings</u>

Instructions: Considering your own experiences at this college, please circle the number of the rating that best represents your opinion or perception. Verbal descriptions of the extremes on the continuum have been provided to assist you in choosing your answers.

Section A. Please rate the level or degree to which the following qualities <u>are present at your community college</u>, with five (5) indicating the highest level of presence and one (1) indicating the lowest level of presence.

1. **Internal communication**--the college's formal and informal communication processes and style (Ex.: articulation of mission, purpose, values, policies, and procedures).

   Open communication   5 4 3 2 1 Closed communication

2. **Organizational structure**--the college's organizational structure and administrative operation (Ex.: the hierarchical lines of authority and requirements for operating within that hierarchy.

   Highly structured   5 4 3 2 1 Loosely structured

3. **Political climate**--the nature and complexity of the college's internal politics (Ex.: the degree to which the chief instructional officer must operate within a political framework in order to accomplish his or her job.

   Highly political   5 4 3 2 1 Not highly political

4. **Professional development opportunities**--the opportunity for chief instructional officers to pursue and participate in professional development activities (Ex.: encouragement to learn, develop, and/or share innovative practices).

   Participation highly   5 4 3 2 1 Participation not
   encouraged   encouraged

5. **Evaluation**--the college's procedures for evaluating chief instructional officers (Ex.: fair and supportive procedures that focus on improvement rather than fault-finding).

   Supportive evaluation   5 4 3 2 1   Non-supportive
   procedures   evaluation procedures

6. **Promotion**--the college's commitment to internal promotion and advancement from within the organization (Ex.: career ladders, internship opportunities, etc.).

   Internal promotions   5 4 3 2 1 Internal promotions not
   encouraged & supported   encouraged & supported

7. **Regard for personal concerns**--the college's sensitivity to and regard for the personal concerns of chief instructional officers (Ex.: college is supportive and flexible during times of personal emergencies.)

High sensitivity   5   4   3   2   1   Low sensitivity

Section B. Please rate <u>your level of satisfaction</u> with each of the college qualities listed below, with five (5) indicating the highest level of satisfaction and one (1) indicating the lowest level of satisfaction.

8. **Internal communication**--the college's formal and informal communication processes and style, (Ex.: articulation of mission, purpose, values, policies, and procedures).

Highly satisfied   5   4   3   2   1   Highly dissatisfied

9. **Organizational structure**--the college's organizational structure and administrative operation (Ex.: the hierarchical lines of authority and requirements for operating within that hierarchy).

Highly satisfied   5   4   3   2   1   Highly dissatisfied

10. **Political climate**--the nature and complexity of the college's internal politics (Ex.: the degree to which the chief instructional officer must operate within a political framework in order to accomplish his or her job.

Highly satisfied   5   4   3   2   1   Highly dissatisfied

11. **Professional development opportunities**--the opportunity for chief instructional officers to pursue and participate in professional development activities (Ex.: encouragement to learn, develop, and/or share innovative practices).

Highly satisfied   5   4   3   2   1   Highly dissatisfied

12. **Evaluation**--the college's procedures for evaluating chief instructional officers (Ex.: fair and supportive procedures that focus on improvement rather than fault-finding).

Highly satisfied   5   4   3   2   1   Highly dissatisfied

13. **Promotion**--the college's commitment to internal promotion and advancement from within the organization (Ex.: career ladders, internship opportunities, etc.).

Highly satisfied   5   4   3   2   1   Highly dissatisfied

14. **Regard for personal concerns**--the college's sensitivity to and regard for the personal concerns of chief instructional officers (Ex.: college is supportive and flexible during times of personal emergencies.)

Highly satisfied   5   4   3   2   1   Highly dissatisfied

Section C. Please rate how important each of the following factors is <u>to you in your position as a community college chief instructional officer</u>, with five (5) indicating highest level of importance and one (1) indicating the lowest level of importance.

15. **Participation in decision making**--the college's process for decision-making and opportunities for involvement by chief instructional officers (Ex.: level of input requested for administrative decisions that involve instructional affairs).

Most important   5   4   3   2   1   Least important

16. **Autonomy, power, and control**--the degree of autonomy, power, and control held by chief instructional officers within the organization (Ex.: decisions made by instructional deans are subject to reversal by supervisor).

Most important   5   4   3   2   1   Least important

17. **Relationships with colleagues**--the quality of the chief instructional officer's relationships with peers, subordinates, and supervisor (Ex.: atmosphere of mutual collegial respect exists).

    a. **With peers:**
Most important   5   4   3   2   1   Least important

    b. **With subordinates:**
Most important   5 4 3 2 1   Least important

    c. **With supervisor:**
Most important   5 4 3 2 1   Least important

18. **Salary and benefits**--the salary and benefits of the chief instructional officer (Ex.: salary and benefits package are equitable and comparable with colleagues in similar situations).

    a. **Salary:**
Most important   5 4 3 2 1   Least important

    b. **Benefits:**
Most important   5 4 3 2 1   Least important

19. **Professional effectiveness**--the perceived overall effectiveness of the chief instructional officer in his or her position (Ex.: "Am I successful in accomplishing the objectives of my position?").

Most important   5 4 3 2 1   Least important

Section D.

20. Please circle the level of your overall <u>satisfaction with your position</u>, with five (5) indicating the highest level of satisfaction and one (1) indicating the lowest level of satisfaction.

Most satisfied   5 4 3 2 1   Least satisfied

Section E.

21. Please circle the level of your overall <u>satisfaction with your college</u>, with five (5) indicating the highest level of satisfaction and one (1) indicating the lowest level of satisfaction.

Most satisfied   5 4 3 2 1   Least satisfied

Part II: <u>Demographic Information</u>

Instructions: Please provide the following demographic information by using a check mark or filling in the blank.

A. Your current position title: _____

B. Academic discipline/s that your oversee:
    _____ All liberal arts & sciences
    _____ Some liberal arts & sciences (please specify):
         _____
    _____ Business and/or Technical
    _____ Continuing Education
    _____ Adult Education
    _____ Other (please specify): _____

C. Number of years you have served as a college administrator:
    _____ Less than 1 year   _____ 10-14 years
    _____ 1-5 years   _____ 15 years or more
    _____ 6-10 years

D. Ethnic group:
    _____ Asian American   _____ White/Caucasian
    _____ Black/African-American   _____ Native American
    _____ Hispanic   _____ Other: (please specify)
         _____

E. Gender:
    _____ Female   _____ Male

F. **Community college classification:** NOTE: The following classifications are taken from Katsinas' unpublished work on community college classifications. Please identify the classification that you believe <u>best</u> describes your college.

    _____ Rural Community College
    _____ Suburban Community College
    _____ Urban/Inner City Community College
    _____ Metropolitan Area District Community College, centralized or decentralized
    _____ Community College Adjacent to Residential University

_____ Any mix of Types 1-5
_____ Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI)
_____ Historically Black Two Year College
_____ Tribally-Controlled Community College
_____ Transfer/General Education Only
_____ Technical Education Only
_____ Private (non-profit and non-sectarian, non-profit sectarian)
_____ Proprietary
_____ Two-Year College at a Four Year Institution

G. Collective Bargaining Status

1. Is there a collective bargaining unit that speaks for the faculty at your college?

_____ Yes   _____ No

2. Is there a collective bargaining unit that speaks for the administrators at your college?

_____ Yes   _____ No

3. If you answered "Yes" to #1 & #2, are these units one in the same?

_____ Yes   _____ No

H. Please use this space to make any comments or observations relating to the content of this survey:

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU!
Please return this survey in the envelope provided
by Friday, March 24, 1995 to:

Department of Educational Leadership
University of Florida
P.O. Box 117049, 2403 Norman Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611-7049

February 28, 1995

Dear Colleague:

On behalf of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida, this letter comes to encourage your support of research that is being conducted in cooperation with the Board of National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA). You are being invited to participate in this study by virtue of your membership in the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). We would appreciate your assistance by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to us by no later than Friday, March 24, 1995. A self-addressed envelope is included in for your convenience.

Our research pertains to organizational climate and job satisfaction as reported by community college chief instructional officers. Recognizing the important role that chief instructional officers play in the successful operation of community colleges, we expect the results of this research to provide direction for enhancing job satisfaction and improving climate at this pivotal level of leadership.

All survey responses will be recorded anonymously. If you would like to receive a copy of the survey results, please submit a request to our office under separate cover.

Thank you in advance for your support of this research. We will be cooperating with the NCIA to disseminate the findings as soon as the project is complete.

Cordially,

Dale F. Campbell   Susan Chappell
Professor and Director   Asst. Director/Principal
                                      Investigator

c: Dr. Patricia Dyer, Chair, NCIA

REFERENCES

Acebo, S. C. (1994). A paradigm shift to team leadership in the community college. In G. A. Baker III, (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 580-588). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchanges. In L. Berkowitz, (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Psychology (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Albrecht, T. L. & Adelman, M. B., and Associates (1987), Communicating social support. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Alderfer, C. P. (1972). Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings. New York: The Free Press.

Alfred, R. L. (1992). Making community colleges more effective: Leading through student success. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 933)

Alfred, R. L., & Carter, P. (1993). Rethinking the business of management. In R. L. Alfred, & P. Carter (Eds.), Changing managerial imperatives (pp. 7-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Alfred, R. L., & Kreider, P. (1991). Creating a culture for institutional effectiveness. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 61(5), 34-39.

Amey, M. J. & Twombley, S. B. (1992). Revisioning leadership in community colleges. Review of Higher Education, 15(2), 125-150.

Andrews, H. A. (1991). Negative impact of faculty contract negotiations on community college faculty evaluation systems. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 343 628)

Annunziato, F. R. (1993). <u>Directory of faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education</u>. New York: The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions--Baruch College, The City University of New York.

Annunziato, F. R. (1994). <u>Directory of faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education</u>. New York: The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions--Baruch College, The City University of New York.

Argyris, C. (1957). <u>Personality and organization: The conflict between the system and the individual</u>. New York: Harper & Row.

Assar, K. E. (1993). Quantum quality at Maricopa. <u>Change, 25</u>(3), 32-35.

Austin, A. E. (1991). <u>The academic workplace audit</u>. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 338 132)

Barr, R. (1988). <u>The spring 1988 Palomar College climate survey: An analysis with comparisons to the fall 1986 survey</u>. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 320 615)

Beck, R. C. (1990). <u>Motivation: Theories and principles</u> (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bess, J. L. (1988). <u>Collegiality and bureaucracy in the modern university: The influence of information and power</u> on decision-making structures. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bielby, W. T. & Baron, J. N. (1987). Undoing discrimination: Job integration and comparable worth. In C. Bose & G. Spitze (Eds.), <u>Ingredients for womens' employment policy</u> (pp. 211-229). Albany: Statue University of New York Press.

Bing, R., & Dye, L. (1992). The danger of hierarchical decision-making. <u>Academe, 78</u>(4), 16-18.

Birnbaum, R. (1989). Leadership and followership: The cybernetics of university governance. In J. H. Schuster, L. H. Miller, and Associates (Eds.), <u>Governing tomorrow's campus: Perspectives and agendas</u>. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Co.

Blix, A. G., Cruise, R. J., Mitchell, B. M., and Blix, G. G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. Educational Research, 36, 157-169.

Blix, A. G. & Lee, J. W. (1991). Occupational stress among university administrators. Research in Higher Education, 32, 289-302.

Block, P. (1987). The empowered manager: Positive political skills at work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boggs, G. R., & Cater, J. J. (1994). The historical development of academic programs in community colleges. In G. A. Baker III, (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 218-266). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boone, C. W. (1986). The relationship between job characteristics, role conflict, role ambiguity, internal locus of control and job satisfaction of college and university administrators (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, A3676.

Bretz, R. D. Jr., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44(1), 32-54.

Brigham, S. E. (1993). TQM: Lessons we can learn from industry. Change, 25(3), 42-48.

Burr, R. K. (1980). Job satisfaction determinants for selected administrators in Florida's community colleges and universities: An application of Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, A3794.

Burris, V. & Wharton, A. (1982). Sex segregation in the U.S. labor force. Review of Radical Political Economics, 14(3), 43-56.

Caplan, R. D. & Van Harrison, R. (1993). Person-environment fit theory: Some history, recent developments, and future directions. Journal of Social Issues, 49(4), 253-275.

Carleo, A. S. W. (1989). Job satisfaction among faculty in the Los Angeles Community College District (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, A0058.

Cassidy, M. L. & Warren, B. O. (1991). Status consistency and work satisfaction among professional and managerial women and men. Gender and Society, 5(2), 193-206.

Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36, 459-484.

Chieffo, A. M. (1991). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community college leadership teams. Community College Review, 19(2) 15-24.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1994). The challenging environment: Context, concepts, and crises. In A. M. Cohen & F. B. Brawer (Eds.), Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice (pp. 5-21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Conway, J. A. (1984). The myth, mystery, and mastery of participative decision making in education. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 11-40.

Croft, D. B. & Halpin, A. W. (1963). The organizational climate of schools. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center.

Davis, K. (1981). Human behavior at work: Organizational behavior (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Deal, T. E., & Jenkins, W. A. (1994). Spotlighting backstage employees: Organizing the hidden side of colleges and universities. Business Officer, 27(9), 36-41.

Deas, E. (1994). Board and administration relationships contributing to community college climate: A case study. Community College Review, 22(1), 44-52.

Dickmeyer, N. & Cirino, A. M. (1992). Comparative financial statistics for public two-year colleges: FY 1991 peer group sample. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 936)

Dieterly, D. L. & Schneider, B. (1974). The effect of organizational environment on perceived power and climate: A laboratory study. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 11, 316-337.

Dimkpa, D. (1991). The impact of organizational climate and job expectations on black and white managerial job satisfaction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 071)

Douglas, J. (1988). Directory of faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education--Baruch College, City University of New York.

Douglas, J. (1991). Directory of non-faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education--Baruch College, City University of New York.

Downey, H. K., Hellriegel, D., Phelps, M. & Slocum, J. W. (1974). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A comparative analysis. Journal of Business Research, 2. 233-248.

Downey, H. K., Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (1975). Congruence between individual needs, organizational climate, job satisfaction and performance. Academy of Management Journal, 18, 149-155.

Drucker, P. F. (1974). Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Duncan, A. H., & Harlacher, E. L. (1991). The twenty-first century executive leader. Community College Review, 18. (4), 39-47.

Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper and I. T. Robertson (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1991, Vol. 6. New York: Wiley.

Ehrle, E. B., & Bennett, J. B. (1988). Managing the academic enterprise: Case studies for deans and provosts. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Co.

El-Khawas, E. (1992). Campus trends, 1992 (Higher Education Panel Report No. 82). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 922)

Evan, W, M. (1968). A systems model of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept (pp. 107-128). Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Ewell, P. T. (1993). Total quality and academic practice: The idea we've been waiting for? Change, 25(3), 49-55.

Fairman, R. (1973). An empirical investigation of the Herzberg dual factor theory of job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, A6803.

Finley, C. E. (1991). The relationship between unionization and job satisfaction among two-year college faculty. Community College Review, 19(2), 53-60.

Fisher, J. L. (1993). TQM: A warning for higher education. Educational Record, 74(2), 15-19.

Fisher, S. (1994). Stress in academic life: The mental assembly line. Bristol, PA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Flynn, G. (1994). Attracting the right employees--and keeping them. Personnel Journal, 73(12), 44-49.

Forehand, G. A. (1968). On the interaction of persons and organizations. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept (pp. 65-84). Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Franklin, H. D. (1991). Faculty leadership: A dynamic, potent force for comprehensive institutional development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 344 629)

Friedlander, F., & Margulies, N. (1969). Multiple impact of organizational climate and individual system upon job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 22, 171-183.

Fryer, T. W., Jr. (1989). Servants of the dream (Paper presented at the conference of the League for Innovation in the Community College, "Leadership 2000"). San Francisco, CA, June 11-14, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 308 893)

Fryer, T. W., Jr. & Lovas, J. C. (1990). Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision-making in the community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gabert, G. (1994). Human resource management in community colleges. In G. A. Baker, III, (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 377-385). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Gati, I. (1989). Person-environment fit research: Problems and prospects. _Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35_(4), 181-193.

Gillett-Karam, R. (1991). _Underrepresentation and the question of diversity: Women and minorities in the community college_ (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 551)

Gilligan, C. (1982). _In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development_. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Ginsburg, S. G. (1994a). Accounting for the human factor. _Trusteeship, 2_(4), 20-23.

Ginsburg, S. G. (1994b). Investing in human resources: Higher education needs to focus on human resources issues. _Business Officer, 27_(12), 28-31.

Glasser, W. (1994). _The control theory manager: Combining the control theory of William Glasser and the wisdom of W. Edwards Deming to explain both what quality is and what lead managers do to achieve it_. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers, Inc.

Glick, N. L. P. (1992). Job satisfaction among academic administrators. _Research in Higher Education, 33_, 625-639.

Griffin, S. D. (1990). Job satisfaction in shared decision-making schools: Herzberg's theory investigated (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1990). _Dissertation Abstracts International, 52_, A0757.

Griffiths, D. E. (1968). Administration as decision-making. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.), _Administrative theory in education_ (pp. 119-149). New York: Macmillan.

Groseth, R. S. (1978). An investigation of the motivator-hygiene theory of job satisfaction among selected student affairs administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1978). _Dissertation Abstracts International, 39_, A1952.

Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). _Understanding job satisfaction_. New York: Wiley.

Guion, R. M. (1973). A note on organizational climate. _Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 9_, 120-125.

Halpin, A. (1966). _Theory and research in administration_. New York: Macmillan.

Hamner, W. C. & Organ, D. (1978). Organizational behavior: An applied psychological approach. Dallas: Business Publications.

Hanson, E. M. (1985). Educational administration and organizational behavior (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Harlacher, E. L., & Gollattscheck, J. F. (1994). Leadership for a new century: Implications for community college management. In A. M. Hoffman and D. J. Julius (Eds.), Managing community and junior colleges: Perspectives for the next century (pp. 3-16). Washington, DC: CUPA.

Harris, Z. (1992). Creating a climate of institutional inclusiveness. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 63(1), 38-40.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hersi, D. T. (1993). Factors contributing to job satisfaction for women in higher education administration. CUPA Journal, 44(2), 29-35.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, Inc.

Herzberg, F. (1976). The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. S. (1959). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Heverly, M. A. & Cornesky, R. A. (1992). Total quality management: Increasing productivity and decreasing costs. In C. S. Hollins (Ed.), Containing costs and improving productivity in higher education (pp.103-114). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.

Hutton, J. B. & Jobe, M. E. (1985). Job satisfaction of community college faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 9, 317-324.

Jaeger, R. M. & Tesh, A. S. (1989). Professional satisfaction and dissatisfaction among practicing counselors: Implications for counselor education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 532)

Jahanshahi, B. (1985). The relationship between
organizational climate and job satisfaction of academic
administrators in selected community colleges and
universities (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State
University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International,
46, A2939.

Jenks, D. M., Jr. (1992). The faculty empowerment concept at
Cleveland Community College. (Doctoral dissertation,
University of South Carolina, 1992). Dissertation
Abstracts International, 53, A3815.

Johannesson, R. E. (1973). Some problems in the measurement
of organizational climate. Organizational Behavior and
Human Performance, 10, 118-144.

Johns, J. R. (1993). The duties and responsibilities of
chief academic officers at selected community colleges
(Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1993).
Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, A1613.

Johnson, E. W. & McClelland, D. C. (1984). Learning to
Achieve. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (1990). The role communication
plays in developing and reducing organizational stress
and burnout. Bulletin of the Association for Business
Communication, 53(1), 5-9.

Johnson, T. (1993). An overview of issues surrounding
faculty burnout (Paper presented at the Annual
Convention of the Western States Communication
Association). Albuquerque, NM: February 14, 1993). (ERIC
Document Reproduction Service No. ED 369 373)

Kanter, R. M. (1985). The changemasters: Innovation and
entrepreneurship in the American corporation. New York:
Simon & Shuster, Inc.

Katsinas, S. G. (1995). Toward a classification system for
community colleges. Unpublished manuscript.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of
organizations (2nd. ed.). New York: Wiley.

Katz, R. N., & West, R. P. (1992). Sustaining excellence in
the 21st century: A vision and strategies for college
and university administration. (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. 355 843)

Katzell, R. A. (1979). Changing attitudes toward work. In C.
Kerr & J. M. Rosow (Eds.), Work in America: The decade
ahead (pp. 35-57). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Katzell, R. A., & Thompson, D. E. (1990). Work motivation: Theory and practice. American Psychologist, 45(2), 144-153.

Kelly, J. G. (1988). Leadership behavior that produces a positive college climate: Putting your energy in the right places. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 999)

Kirby, C. (1987). A comparative study of the perception of leadership behavior in men and women chief academic officers of small independent colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, Miami University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, A1126.

Kline, T. J. B. & Boyd, J. E. (1991). Organizational Structure, context, and climate: Their relationships to job satisfaction at three managerial levels. Journal of General Psychology, 118, 305-316.

Knowles, T. (1994). Total quality management (TQM) in community colleges (Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 370 616)

Kozal, A. P. (1979). An application of the reformulated theory of job satisfaction to selected administrative affairs staff in the Florida State University System. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, A1788.

LaFollette, W. R. & Sims, H. P. (1975). Is satisfaction redundant with organizational climate? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 257-278.

Langley, J. M. (1994). Motivational messages. Currents, 20(2), 16-19.

Lauffer, A. (1985). Careers, colleagues, and conflicts: Understanding gender, race and ethnicity in the workplace. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lawler, E. E. (1986). High involvement management: Participative strategies for improving management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler, E. E., III (1992). The ultimate advantage: Creating the high involvement organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lehman, P. W. (1988). Study guide for Shavelson statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Levy, S. G. (1989). Organizational climate and job
    satisfaction as reported by Pennsylvania community
    college middle-level administrators (Doctoral
    dissertation, Lehigh University, 1989). Dissertation
    Abstracts International, 50, A1509.

Lewin, K. (1935). A dynamic theory of personality: Selected
    papers (D. K. Adams & K. E. Zener, Trans.). New York:
    McGraw-Hill.

Lewis, M. D. (1992). Academic leadership and community
    college chief instructional officers at selected single
    college districts (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont
    Graduate School, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts
    International, 53, A2626.

Likert, R. L. (1967). The human organization: Its management
    and value. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. (1968). Motivation and
    organizational climate. Boston: Division of Research,
    Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard
    University.

Locke, E. A. (1976). Nature and causes of job satisfaction.
    In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and
    organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand
    McNally.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1991). Educational
    administration: Concepts and practices. Belmont, CA:
    Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Marchese, T. (1993). TQM: A time for ideas. Change, 25(5),
    10-13.

Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York:
    Harper & Row.

Mayo, E. (1933). The human problems of an industrial
    civilization. New York: Macmillan.

McBride, S. A., Munday, R. G., & Tunnell, J. (1992).
    Community college faculty, job satisfaction, and
    propensity to leave. Community/Junior College Quarterly
    of Research and Practice, 16(2), 157-165.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell. (1976). The
    achievement motive. New York: Irvington Publishers.

McCormick, E. J. & Ilgen, D. R. (1980). Industrial
    psychology (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-
    Hall.

McKee, J. G. (1991). Community college presidents and faculty job satisfaction. Community/Junior College Journal of Research and Practice, 15(1), 33-46.

Mech, T. F. (1994). The managerial roles of chief academic officers and comprehensive colleges and universities: The influence of organizational and personal characteristics. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, A1485.

Miller, L. H. (1989). Faculty professionalism: The responsibilities of shared governance. In J. H. Schuster, L. H. Miller & Associates (Eds.), Governing tomorrow's campus: Perspectives and agendas (pp.102-115). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Co.

Milosheff, E. (1990). Factors contributing to job satisfaction at the community college. Community College Review, 18(1), 12-22.

Mintzberg, H. (1989). Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations. New York: The Free Press.

Mirvis, P. H. & Lawler, E. E. III (1980). Measuring the financial impact of employee attitudes. In D. Katz, R. L. Kahn, & J. S. Adams, (Eds.), The study of organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murray, H. A., Barrett, W. G., & Homburger, E. (1938). Explorations in personality: A clinical and experimental study of fifty men of college age, by the workers at the Harvard psychological clinic. New York: Oxford University Press.

Myran, G., & Howdeyshell, L. (1994). Strategic management of community colleges in dynamic environment. In G. A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission and management (pp. 589-602). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

National Symposium on Higher Education Finance and Management Issues in the 1990s. Proceedings. Washington, D.C., February 24-26, 1991.

Nkereuwem, E. E. (1990). Issues on the relationship between job satisfaction, job attitudes, and work behavior among the staff in academic libraries. Information Services and Use, 10(5), 281-291.

North, J. D. (1991). Strangers in a strange land: Women in higher education administration. <u>Initiatives, 54</u>(2), 43-53.

O'Banion, T. (1994). Teaching and learning: A mandate for the Nineties. <u>Community College Journal, 64</u>(4), 20-25.

Orpen, C. (1994). Organizational level as a moderator of the relationship between perceived political climate and employees' work attitudes. <u>Psychological Reports, 75</u>, 769-770.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology, 77</u>, 963-974.

Owens, R. G. (1991). <u>Organizational behavior in education</u> (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Owens, R. G. (1995). <u>Organizational behavior in education</u> (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Pace, C. R. (1968). The measurement of college environments. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), <u>Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept</u> (pp. 129-150). Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business, Harvard University.

Pardee, R. L. (1990). <u>Motivation theories of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor and McClelland: A literature review of selected theories dealing with job satisfaction and motivation</u>. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 316 767)

Parnell, D. (1990). <u>Dateline 2000: The new higher education agenda</u>. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Payne, R. L., Fineman, S., & Wall, T. D. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A conceptual synthesis. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16</u>, 45-62.

Perkins, J. R. (1991). Scholarship and the academic dean. In G. B. Vaughan & J. C. Palmer, (Eds.), <u>Enhancing teaching and administration through scholarship</u> (pp. 49- 58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pinder, C. C. (1984). <u>Work motivation: Theory, issues, and applications</u>. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Polishook, I. H. & Nielsen, R. M. (1989). Governance, faculty unions, and the changing workplace. In J. H. Schuster, L. H. Miller & Associates (Eds.), Governing tomorrow's campus: Perspectives and agendas (pp. 141-151). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Co.

Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., and Hackman, J. R. (1975). Behavior in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Portolan, J. S. (1992). Developing a statewide organization and exploring a redefined role for instructional administrators in California community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, A3122.

Report of the Wingspread Group on Higher Education, (1993). An American imperative: Higher expectations for higher education. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation.

Reskin, B. F. & Roos, P. (1987). Status hierarchies and sex segregation. In C. Bose & G. Spitze (Eds.), Ingredients for women's employment policy (pp. 3-22). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rieley, J. B. (1992). How to optimize organizational effectiveness through leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363 951)

Roe, M. A. & Baker, G. A. (1989). The development of community college leaders: A challenge for our future. Community College Review, 16(4), 5-16.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). Management and the worker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rollins, T. R. (1972). An analysis of organizational climate and employee satisfaction in the North Carolina community college system (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, A6600.

Satterlee, B. (1988). A study to determine the job satisfaction of the engineering/industrial faculty at Delgado Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 593)

Schauerman, S. & Peachy, B. (1993). Strategies for implementation: The El Camino TQM story. Torrence, CA: El Camino Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 355 988)

Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climates. Personnel Psychology: A Journal of Applied Research, 28, 447-449.

Schneider, B. & Snyder, R. A. (1975). Some relationships
    between job satisfaction and organizational climate.
    Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 318-328.

Schonwetter, D. J., Dieter, J., Bond, S. L. & Perry, R. P.
    (1993). Women academic and career administrators' role
    perceptions and occupational satisfaction: Implications
    for appointment and professional development (Paper
    presented at the annual meeting of the American
    Educational Research Association). Atlanta, GA: April
    16, 1993. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360
    895)

Scorsone, A. L. (1990). Relationships between organizational
    climate and leadership style in the fourteen University
    of Kentucky community colleges (KY). (Doctoral
    dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1990).
    Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, A3312.

Senge, P. (1991). The fifth discipline: The art and practice
    of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Seymour, D. (1993). TQM: Focus on performance, not
    resources. Educational Record, 74(2), 6-14.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration.
    Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, S. S. (1989). An investigation of communication
    satisfaction and organizational climate in state
    community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Peabody
    College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 1989).
    Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 1910A.

Sokoloff, N. (1987). The increase of Black and White women
    in the professions: A contradictory process. In C. Bose
    & G. Spitze (Eds.), Ingredients for women's employment
    policy pp. 53-72.

Spence, C. S., & Stuckman, J. A. (1994). Community college
    faculty and staff collaborating in service: Total
    quality management. In A. M. Hoffman & D. J. Julius
    (Eds.), Managing community and junior colleges:
    Perspectives for a new century (pp. 207-220).
    Washington, DC: CUPA.

Staas, S. B. (1994). Implementing total quality management at a community college: The adventure and the lessons learned. In F. R. Annunziato & B. H. Johnson (Eds.), Higher education collective bargaining during a period of change. Proceedings of the twenty-second annual conference, April, 1994. New York: The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions--Baruch College, The City University of New York.

Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1975). Motivation and work behavior (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stern, G. C. (1970). People in context: Measuring person environment congruence in education and industry. New York: Wiley.

Stevens, P. (1990). Handling office politics (2nd ed.). Sydney, Australia: Centre for Worklife Counseling.

Tagiuri, R. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept (pp. 11-34). Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Talbert-Hersi, D. (1991). The impact of chronic job stressors and work support on job satisfaction for women in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Howard University, 1991). American Doctoral Dissertations, X1992.

Thomas, S. C. (1977). An application of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job attitudes to selected community college administrative roles. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, A3326.

Thor, L. M. (1993). The human side of quality: Employee care and empowerment (Paper presented at the annual convention of the League for Innovation in the Community College). Irvine, CA: February 1, 1993. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 044)

Thor, L. M. (1994). Introducing the human side of total quality management into educational institutions. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 18, 359-368.

Torres, B. M. & Kapes, J. T. (1990). Work values and job satisfaction of potential minority leaders in community college settings. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 469)

Torres, B. M. & Kapes, J. T. (1992). The relationship between work values and job satisfaction for community college leadership trainees: A replication and cross validation.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 344 626)

Tranberg, M., Slane, S., Ekeberg, S. E. (1993). The relation between interest congruence and satisfaction: A metaanalysis. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42, 253-264.

Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1988). The academic dean: Dove, dragon, and diplomat. New York: Macmillan.

Twombley, S. B., & Amey, M. J. (1994). Leadership skills for participative governance. In G. A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 269-283). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Uziogwe, E. O. (1994). Management styles and demographic characteristics of chief academic officers (Doctoral dissertation, 1994, University of Toledo). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, A0440.

Vaughan, G. B. (1989). Leadership in transition: The community college presidency. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. (1990). Pathway to the presidency. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Vroom, F. H. (1982). Work and motivation. Malabar, FL: R. E. Krieger Publishing Co. (Reprint: Originally published New York: Wiley, 1964.)

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Wattenbarger, J. L. (1994). New theories of leadership and human resources management for community colleges. In A. M. Hoffman & D. J. Julius (Eds.), Managing community and junior colleges: Perspectives for a new century (pp. 69-78). Washington, DC: CUPA.

Weick, K. E. (1991). Educational organizations as loosely couple systems. In M. W. Peterson (Ed.), Organization and governance in higher education (pp. 103-117). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Welker, W. F. & Morgan, S. D. (1991). One step beyond what the literature says on institutional effectiveness for community, junior and technical colleges. Community College Review, 19(2), 25-31.

Witt, A., Wattenbarger, J. L., Gollattscheck, J. F., & Suppiger, J. E. (1994). America's community colleges: The first century. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Witt, L. A. & Myers, J. G. (1992). Perceived environmental uncertainty and participation in decision-making in the prediction of perceptions of the fairness of personnel decisions. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 12(3), 49-56.

Witt, L. A. & Nye, L. G. (1992). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 910-917.

Wright, H. A. (1991). Competencies of chief instructional officers in two-year public colleges in Texas (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, A1229.

Ziel, J. W. (1992). A case study of selected community colleges' exemplary institutional effectiveness models (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, A0698.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Susan Chappell is an 18-year veteran of Florida's community college system. She holds a bachelor's degree in English from LaGrange College, Georgia, and a masters in education degree from the University of North Florida, Jacksonville. Prior to her full-time enrollment in the educational leadership program at the University of Florida, Ms. Chappell held a number of increasingly responsible positions at Florida Community College at Jacksonville and St. Johns River Community College. Most recently she served as dean of Student Development and Articulation.

In 1993, Ms. Chappell was awarded James L. Wattenbarger Community College Leadership Fellowship established by Information Systems of Florida. As assistant director for the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida, Ms. Chappell assisted in planning and coordinating the 1995 Futures Assembly, a national meeting of community college leaders that addressed future directions for community colleges beyond the year 2000.

In addition to her work as educational leader and student, Ms. Chappell is a lifetime member of the Florida Association of Community Colleges (FACC). She is also a member of Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) and the American Association of Women in Community Colleges (AAWCC).